DOCUMENT RESUME

LI 002 718

ED 048 909

AUTHOR Goldstein, Melvin S.

TITLE Collective Bargaining in the Field of Librarianship.

PUB DATE Dec 68

NOTE 173p.; Paper prepared for course in Library Personnel Relations at Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining, *Collective Negotiation, Government Libraries, *Librarians, Library Surveys, *Negotiation Agreements, Professional Personnel, Public Libraries, *Unions, University Libraries

IDENTIFIERS Librarianship, *Library Unions

ABSTRACT

As a matter of economic necessity, librarians must employ the technique of unionization, as though there were no professional associations, in order to obtain better salaries and working conditions. They must also employ the professional associations to seek out and bring about better library service, improve the techniques of librarianship and the image of librarians as though there were no unions. Librarians have an obligation to their profession to become involved in all phases of library policy including the establishment and the running of branches, as well as promotions, transfers and classifications. (Author)

ED048909

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Melvin S. Goldstein
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
IN THE
FIELD OF LIBRARIANSHIP

by

MELVIN S. GOLDSTEIN

PRATT INSTITUTE

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK
December 1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LI 002 718

Copyright 1969 by Melvin S. Goldstein
All Rights Reserved

Melvin S. Goldstein
5123 Post Road
New York, N.Y. 10471

A Brief History of Collective Bargaining Efforts on Behalf of Professional Librarians in the United States, Digests of Individual Collective Bargaining Agreements Currently in Force, The Status of Certain Negotiations for Collective Bargaining Agreements, with References to other Matters Relating to the Subject of Unionization in Libraries and Comments on the Role of Unions in the Field of Librarianship, Based on a Survey of the 154 Libraries in the United States Holding more than 500,000 Volumes

Submitted to Mary Y. Parr, Associate Professor of Librarianship and Director of Library Extension Programs, as a Term Paper for LS 551, Library Personnel Relations, December 16, 1968.

Melvin S. Goldstein

CONTENTS

Statement of Purpose 1

Introduction 2

Brief Historical Review 11

The Special Position of Librarianship 13

Definitions 16

The Position of the American Library Association 17

State Library Associations 22

Current Status of Library Unions 26

Public Libraries Operating Under Collective Bargaining Agreements 30
- Detroit Public Library 30
- New York City 41
  - Brooklyn Public Library 42
  - New York Public Library 50
  - Queens Borough Public Library 54
- The Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County 61
- The Free Library of Philadelphia 62
- Milwaukee Public Library 66

Public Libraries Operating with Unions 70
- Contra Costa County Library 70
- Fresno County Free Library 71
- Los Angeles Public Library 72
- Los Angeles County Public Library 75
- Oakland Public Library 77
- San Francisco Public Library 78
- Public Library of the District of Columbia 78
- Chicago Public Library 79
- Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore 84
- The Boston Public Library 85
- Grand Rapids Public Library 87
- Minneapolis Public Library 88
- The Saint Paul Public Library 92
- Buffalo and Erie County Public Library 92
- Cleveland Public Library 96
- Seattle Public Library 99

University Libraries Operating with Unions 100
- University of California at Berkeley 100
- The City University of New York 101
- University of Pennsylvania 103

Government Libraries 105
    State Libraries 105
    Federal Libraries 110
        The National Agricultural Library 110
        Department of the Interior Library 111
        Department of State Library 111
        The Library of Congress 111
        Veterans Administration Library Service 113
        National Library of Medicine 114

Libraries Where Unions Have Passed out of Existence 115
    Atlanta Public Library 115
    Wayne County Federated Library System 116
    Butte Public Library 117
    The Public Library of Newark New Jersey 118

Public Libraries with Non-Professional Unions Only 119
    Ramapo Catskill Library System 119
    Rochester Public Library 119
    Library Association of Portland (Oregon) 120

University Libraries - Faculty Status and Faculty Rank 121

Conclusion 134

Public Libraries to which Letters were Sent 139

Government Libraries to which Letters were Sent 145

University Libraries to which Letters were Sent 147

Unions and Employee Organizations to which Letters were Sent 155

Bibliography

    Periodical Literature 161
    Pamphlets and Term Papers 167
    Book 167

Statement of Purpose

In October, 1939, Bernard Berelson,[1] while still a student at the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, published in The Library Quarterly the first and, unfortunately, the last comprehensive history, review and critique on library unionization. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to set forth a history of library unionization in the United States from the inception of this activity until now, to note the current status of this phenomenon in individual libraries and to consider and comment on some aspects of the unionization of librarians, existing agreements, the terms of current contracts and some of the details of current understandings between unions and libraries as well as the demands of some unions. It is not intended in this paper to report on, analyze or compare salaries because this will be treated in a separate paper. It must also be noted that this paper will deal with the unionization of professional librarians and not necessarily with the unionization of other library personnel such as clerks, guards, maintenance people and bookmobile drivers. And away we go!

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization," The Library Quarterly, IX (October, 1939), 477-510.

Introduction

In order to gather material for this presentation of the history of library unions in the United States, the following methods were employed to locate sources and to obtain the information:

I checked Library Literature for the period 1921 through 1968 under all pertinent subject headings. I read and abstracted every article relating to the subject except items that appeared in Library Journal prior to 1944 not available at Pratt Institute and in certain other publications or issues not available at Pratt. In those cases, however, I abstracted or copied the summaries printed in Library Literature. Articles mentioned in Library Literature that were published in library union newsletters were in some cases located in the Economics Division of the New York Public Library and were read and abstracted there. All abstracts were typewritten and filed.

"Bibliography of Library Economy 1876-1920" by H.G.T. Cannons, and "A Bibliography of Librarianship," Selected by Margaret Burton and Marion E. Visburgh, were checked but revealed nothing.

Every issue of Library Journal and A.L.A.Bulletin for the period April, 1968 through November, 1968, was checked for pertinent material because those items had not yet been indexed by Library Literature. I also went to other published materials to which I was specially referred and which are not indexed in Library Literature, such as Harold Jones's article in California Voice for July, 1968, and The Michigan Librarian for December 1966.

Every volume of A.L.A. Bulletin 1938 through 1957 was examined for information on the Library Unions Round Table in view of a brief reference in Library Literature in 1942.

I checked the catalogs in the main reference room in the Economics Division of the New York Public Library and located some news-papers and bulletins published by library unions but little else that was not available at Pratt.

I selected from the American Library Association's "Directory of American Libraries, 1966-67," every library in the United States with 500,000 volumes or more and wrote individual letters to 154 library directors (59 public libraries, 20 government libraries, 75 university libraries) for information on the development of collective representation. The list taken from the ALA "Directory" was based on volumes only and not on items, except in the case of the Library of Congress for which the only information given is "44,189,000 items." "Circulation" and "population served" were not considered. The university library group includes university and college libraries as well as some special libraries such as the Center for Research Libraries. The government libraries include State Libraries, libraries of various departments of the United States Government and, of course, the Library of Congress.

After consulting the "Directory of National and International Labor Unions in the United States, 1965," and the "Directory of Labor Organizations in New York State, Special Bulletin No. 238, September, 1967," individual letters were sent to 29 unions that might possibly be interested in the organization of library employees to determine the development of collective representation among library personnel.

Letters were sent to the American Library Association and some correspondence ensued with Miss Ruth Frame of the Library Administration Division but this produced very little hard information.

A Xeroxed letter, with an individual address and salutation, was sent to each of the State Library Associations in order to determine whether any of them would help library staffs with collective representation and collective bargaining.

Xeroxed letters with individualized addresses and salutations were sent to every university library on my list asking whether the librarians hold faculty status, faculty rank or neither.

An individually prepared letter requesting information was sent to every union, every person and every institution mentioned in the body of any literature or correspondence that came to hand who, it was thought, might have some information on the subject. For example, I wrote to Allan Covici, the Editor of CU Voice, published by the Library Chapter of the University Federation of Librarians - Berkeley Campus, who was mentioned in Library Journal for July, 1967.

Reminders were sent out regularly to those who failed to reply. Sometimes these were Xeroxed but more often they were individually written. Letters were also sent to clarify questions that arose in correspondence or to comment on various points. The following is a table showing the number of letters sent:

	Individually typed	Xeroxed	
Public Libraries	122	14	
Local unions in connection with specific public libraries	40		
Universities	91	64	
Union Headquarters	37		
Government Libraries	39		
State Library Associations	9	51	
	337	129	= 466

Note is to be taken that the individually typed original letters were personalized in address and salutation as well as in the body where an attempt was made in each case to relate to something that has taken place in connection with the specific library.

I had telephone conversations with many librarians in various parts of the country. These calls were usually made when I felt that on the basis of the literature some important union activity was taking place at the particular library but I was not able to get any information from the library director by letter and was not successful in getting a line on the union evidently in charge of the organizing activity. Some calls were also made to clear up questions that arose in correspondence.

There were only two personal interviews, one with Lawrence Brandwein, President of the Brooklyn Local, and one with Robert W. Schmidt, President of the Queens Borough Local. I did not ask for a meeting with the Director of the Brooklyn Public Library because he had referred my inquiry to the Union President.

No replies were received from the following libraries despite numerous follow-up attempts:

Public

Worcester Public Library and Central Massachusetts Regional Library System Headquarters

Columbus (Ohio) Public Library

Government

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

University

Tulane University of Louisiana

University of Virginia

The survey conducted reveals that it is impossible to determine the number of librarians who belong to unions and it is equally impossible to determine the number of unions that count librarians among their members. Library administrations often, and probably with tongue in cheek, say that they know nothing about any unions in the place. The unions are usually just as reluctant to supply information, and union headquarters are either without any knowledge as to what is going on or prefer to indicate that they know nothing about it. The reason for the know-nothingism at union headquarters offices is the competition among unions to sign up public employees. It seems clear, however, that one way or another, there are more librarians in unions than ever before and we find them joining with teachers, with government employees, with other groups both in and out of libraries and as independents.

The American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO) claims that a number of librarians are members[1] but "our membership reports don't indicate occupation."[2] The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) which seems to be most active in the field of organizing librarians, provided information only after several letters and a long distance telephone call.[3] The American Federation of Teachers claims the membership of a number of librarians through its local chapters, particularly in New York.[4] The United Federation of College Teachers, Local 1460, says it has enrolled college librarians[5] and we must assume this is not confined to the City University of New York. The United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, in New York, claims that 850 of the 1,000 librarians in the New York City Public School system are members of UFT.[1] Those who are intrigued by the idea of having the Teamsters organize librarians will be disappointed to learn that the Teamsters report they have never attempted to organize any of the librarians or even bookmobile drivers.[2]

---

[1] Letter from W. J. Voss, Research Director, American Federation of Government Employees, Washington, D.C., August 2, 1968.

[2] Letter from Voss, September 18, 1968.

[3] Telephone conversation with Donald Wasserman, Research and Education Director, AFSCME, Washington, D.C., October 31, 1968.

[4] Letter from John H. Oliver, Assistant Director, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C., August 7, 1968.

[5] Letter from Israel Kugler, President, United Federation of College Teachers, Local 1460, New York City, August 27, 1968.

This paper, therefore, cannot attempt to survey all of the unions that may have librarians as members. I will attempt here only to report on libraries where unions for librarians are known to exist including, of course, that special phenomenon, public libraries operating under a contract with a union which is designated by some authority as the collective bargaining agent for the librarians.

Note must be taken that in view of the greater reluctance on the part of unions to make information available, we have been obliged in this paper to depend more than we would like on information supplied by libraries and library literature.

It should also be made clear here that no public library, no government library and no university library coming within the purview of this survey operates on a closed shop basis in so far as its professional librarians are concerned. However, an agency shop provision has been approved for the Detroit Public Library, the first major library in the country to come under this condition

---

[1] Letter from Sylvia Mendlow, Co-Chairman, UFT Library Committee, United Federation of Teachers, Local 2, New York City, August 5, 1968.

[2] Letter from Abraham Weiss, Economist, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, Washington, D.C., August 7, 1968.

62 persons, on behalf of 56 Public Libraries, wrote in reply to various inquiries. The sex and titles of the 62 break down as follows:

Title	Male	Female
Acting Librarian	2	-
Administrative Assistant	-	1
Assistant City Librarian	2	1
Assistant Director	1	1
Assistant Director of Personnel	1	-
Assistant in the Personnel Office	1	-
Assistant Librarian and Head of Extension	1	-
Assistant to the Director	2	-
Associate Director	-	1
Associate Librarian	1	-
City Librarian	2	1
County Librarian	2	3
Deputy Director	3	-
Director	13	3
Director and Librarian	1	-
Director of Libraries	1	-
Executive Director	1	-
Librarian	5	1
Library Director	1	-
Personnel Director	-	1
Personnel Librarian	-	1
Personnel Manager	1	-
Personnel Officer	4	3
	45	17

Of the 75 University Libraries to which inquiries were sent, 27 persons replied on behalf of 73 libraries. The sex and titles of all who replied break down as follows:

Title	Male	Female
Acting Director of Libraries	4	-
Assistant Director	3	1
Assistant Director of Libraries	1	1
Assistant Director, Personnel and Budget	1	-
Assistant Director of Libraries for Administration	1	-
Assistant Librarian	-	1
Assistant Professor	1	-
Assistant to the Director	-	2
Associate Director	1	-
Associate Director for Public Services	1	-
Associate Director of Libraries	1	-
Associate Librarian for Public Services	2	-
Associate Librarian for Technical Services	-	2
Associate University Librarian	3	-
Dean of Library Administration	1	-
Director	9	-
Director of Libraries	11	1
Director of Libraries and Audio-Visual Center	1	-
Director of University Libraries	2	-
General Reference Librarian	1	-
Head, Reference Department	-	1
Librarian	6	1
Librarian Personnel Officer	1	-
Personnel Librarian	-	2
President, Staff Association	2	-
Secretary to the Librarian	-	1
University Librarian	10	-
No title given	1	-
	64	13

Of the 20 Government libraries to which inquiries were sent, 20 persons replied on behalf of 19 libraries and the following is a breakdown of sex and titles:

Title	Male	Female
Acting Assistant Director	-	1
Acting Librarian of Congress	1	-
Administrative Officer	-	1
Assistant Director	-	1
Coordinator - Public Libraries	1	-
Deputy State Librarian	1	-
Deputy Director	1	-
Director	-	2
Director of Library Services	1	-
Director, Library Service	1	-
Librarian	1	1
State Librarian	5	2
	12	8

Brief Historical Review

The only thing really new about unions in libraries is that in August, 1968, librarians of the Contra Costa County (California) Public Library actually went out on a full-fledged strike. So far as we have been able to determine, this was the first strike in the history of librarianship in this country at least in so far as libraries with more than 500,000 volumes are concerned. Indeed, the only other instance of a strike by librarians that we have been able to document took place in 1957 in three Swedish cities: Umea, Goteburg and Vasteras. But in Sweden the librarians went out as part of an action called by the Swedish Central Organization of Academically Trained Officials including engineers, doctors, lawyers, dentists, clergymen and others.[1]

Otherwise unionization in libraries is strictly old hat. It's been with us and around us for more than fifty years. It hasn't always been altogether visible to everyone in the profession, however, because it has come upon us in waves after long periods of calm. Librarians are now splashing in the middle of the third wave, longer and higher than either of those preceding, and more librarians than ever before are launching their surfboards and are hollering "Ride em cowboy!" while others, mostly administrators, are either shouting "Help!" or making like there is hardly a ripple. The fact is there is much more than a ripple and much less than a flood.

In 1919 there were five library unions, all affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.[2] All of them were large, metropolitan establishments in the east, at a time when the first World War and the economic situation immediately following it prompted workers throughout the country to form unions.

---

[1] J.F. Burness, "Librarians Strike!" Ontario Library Review, XLIV (February, 1960), 4-5.

[2] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

By 1939 there were six library unions in existence (not much of a gain) which were formed because of the extremely poor economic conditions and with the hope that by associating themselves with the militant labor movement the libraries and the librarians could be helped.[1] In some cases they definitely meant to place the libraries before the librarians, a type of dichotomy that has not been helpful.

And now we find only seven major public libraries, within the purview of this study, operating under collective bargaining agreements with a union. Some of these public libraries were dropped into this category quite by accident in that the contracts were actually negotiated between the city governments and unions representing all city employees. In these specific cases I'm afraid that if the librarians had been left to their own devices there might have been no contracts.

In addition there are unions all over the country that count professional librarians among their members. We have identified unions for professionals in at least 14 public libraries, three universities and at least three government libraries including The Library of Congress which boasts two.

Having regard for the number of libraries reviewed for this study, it would appear that while there has been something less than a stampede to unionization by librarians there is certainly an ever growing movement in this direction. But at the moment, it's something like automation in libraries; we hear an awful lot about it but it's hard to find more than one or two libraries that are good living examples.

It seems sad to think that librarians may be turning to unions at a time when many unions are suspected of no longer following liberal policies.

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

The Special Position of Librarianship

Since the beginning of time librarians have had considerable difficulty deciding whether they are white collar workers or members of a respectable profession. They have always been somewhat less than torn but nevertheless undecided about choosing between unionization as a means of improving their working conditions, and their professional organizations to reshape the image of the librarian, to press for higher professional standards and thus achieve a higher living standard. Librarians were commonly characterized as a reticent lot, insecure, almost shy, certainly withdrawn, and to a considerable extent this has been true. Those characteristics are reasons why librarians have tended to look upon themselves not only as professionals but, more importantly, as people a notch or two above the ordinary working man. This train of thought was implemented by avoiding unions and the hurly burly of life in the raw where unions are normally active.

While the librarian who is convinced that librarianship is a profession separate and distinct from ordinary white collar employment and on a par with the learned professions may well be right, he is in an almost unique position as regards the sale of his professional services. Unlike almost every other profession (with the interesting exception of social work, which can be the subject of a separate paper on the similarity of social workers and librarians), the librarian is practically obliged to work for a salary and is almost totally dependent for his livelihood on employment in a private or public institution.

The members of almost every other profession (except for social work) enjoy a degree of freedom in connection with earning a livelihood that simply is not available to the librarian. An engineer can hardly go off and build a bridge on his own but it is common enough for engineers to move from one project to another as consultants and plenty of engineers found their own firms. A nurse is normally employed in a hospital but a nurse often works for individual patients as and when she pleases. Physicians, attorneys, chemists, even teachers who may give private lessons and who may even found their own classes or private schools, all possess a degree of independence that in the last analysis is manifested in their ability to hang out their own shingles. But not the professional librarian.

Of course, the possibility exists for a librarian to be an independent entrepreneur. A few have established private reference services of one kind or another and this may well spread. But I think that we can generally agree that for all practical intents and purposes the librarian cannot quite establish his own library. A librarian, by the very nature of the profession, cannot be an independent operator. It would seem, therefore, that the librarian, destined to be a salaried employee in the big business of libraries would naturally turn to the union. Mais non.

On the one hand there's the tradition of the thing. A genteel occupation, relatively secluded, with a large number of women, historically with a low concentration of people in any given area, the librarian by background and disposition has yearned to identify with the learned professions. Even today, strong and aggressive library staff associations with all the earmarks of unions shy away from referring to themselves as unions and stress the professional association aspect of the thing.

On the other hand, however, are the realities of existence. Librarians are interested in earning a livelihood - and maybe a little more. Acting as individuals they have not moved as far as some groups have with the aid of unions. The Library Associations simply do not look upon themselves as being responsible for getting more money for librarians. As the librarians' dollar shrinks the librarians have found the unions somewhat more attractive, particularly the unions which have demonstrated ability at getting instant raises. The librarians used to rationalize that, after all, other professions have unions - look at the musicians, the variety artists, the newspaper writers, artists and others - none of which, incidentally, demand a graduate degree. Then along came the mild mannered teacher and his tough union and in the current third phase of library unionization the librarians stumbled on an excuse for which they waited for a long time. If the teachers (professionals!) can do it, if the social workers (professionals!) can do it, then we can too! And as they move to unions, asking for those sweet salary increases they speak of improving library service. After all, by getting better salaries and improved working conditions better people will naturally flock to the profession. Sounds like the teachers? I'm afraid so, but it doesn't have to follow the teachers union all the way. There are other possibilities.

Definitions

Webster's second edition defines "labor union" as: "A trade-union of laborers. Any labor organization created for the purpose of advancing the interests of its members." The definition for "trade union" is given as: "A voluntary association of working people organized to further or maintain their rights privileges, and interests with respect to wages, hours, and conditions of labor, efficiency, education, mutual insurance customs, etc. . . . In a general sense, a voluntary combination for mutual aid of any persons engaged in trade, as of employers, or employers and workmen."

Webster's definition for "profession" is: "a. The occupation, if not purely commercial, mechanical, agricultural, or the like, to which one devotes oneself; a calling in which one professes to have acquired some special knowledge used by way either of instructing, guiding, or advising others or of serving them in some art; as, the profession of arms, of teaching, of chemist. The three professions, or learned professions, is a name often used for the professions of theology, law and medicine. b. Broadly, one's principal calling, vocation, or employment."

With this in mind, for the purposes of this paper we will consider that any organization of librarians, regardless of the name it chooses, that devotes itself primarily to improving and protecting the salaries, working conditions and general perquisites of librarians is a union.

Any organization, however, that devotes itself primarily to an exchange of views among librarians, the development of interest in librarianship and the general improvement of the profession and the extension of library service will, for the purposes of this paper, be considered a professional organization and not a union.

The Position of The American Library Association

While the American Library Association has not taken a specific or definite stand with regard to the unionization of librarians, there has been not only discussion of the subject in A.L.A. councils and pronouncements by the organization's officers but even official recognition of the fact that unions in libraries do exist and that librarians might be interested in them. As time has passed the attitude of A.L.A. toward unionization of libraries has undergone a tardy but normal evolutionary change.

In 1938 when Milton James Ferguson, the President of A.L.A. addressed the A.L.A. convention,[1] he looked way down his nose at unions and sniffed: "when, if ever, unionism comes into the library, then we will lower our standards, our morale, our self-respect and our appeal to those we serve." He feared that unionization "is flatly opposed to the principles which have made American librarianship a useful and proud service." He added: "I am sure that if we keep our faith, in the manner of our predecessors, we will do our part, small or large, to make our nation one of intelligent individuals, worthy of the opportunities of this western freedom." Some of the comment that followed this was almost as biased as Dr. Ferguson's own remarks. One joker even wrote that the effectiveness of librarians in unions has "been increased by the realization that they are contributing to labor's fight for increased means and increased leisure that is prerequisite to proper appreciation and enjoyment of books, and to education that is popular and truly democractic."[2] Ha! Evidently unions and the working man have changed along with libraries.

The Third Activities Committee of A.L.A. went into the subject and, as might have been expected, showered blessings on all concerned.[3]

---

[1] Milton James Ferguson, President A.L.A., 1938-39, "Address," ALA Bulletin XXXII (July, 1938), 421-26.

[2] Merritt, L.C. ALA Bulletin XXXII (August, 1938), 522.

[3] ALA Bulletin XXXVII (December, 1939), 796-7.

The Committee said that staff association should be encouraged "but did not specifically express a similar opinion on union librarians." At the same time, however, the Committee expressed the belief that "library unions will increase in number" and that "the A.L.A. must frankly recognize that library unions may be able to contribute to the promotion of library service and should be encouraged and aided in so far as their efforts tend toward this end." The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees interpreted this as an endorsement by the A.L.A. of the need for unions in libraries.[1]

There was evidently enough interest in unions among A.L.A. members at the time to bring about the formation of an extraordinary (for that time) Round Table at the A.L.A. convention in Kansas City in 1938,[2] actually the convention at which Dr. Ferguson delivered his address. This was the Library Unions Round Table formed at a meeting of representatives from unions of library employees. At that time, remember, there were still only six libraries that had unions and nobody had given any thought to anything as drastic as collective bargaining contracts. LURT was formed for the presumably excellent purposes of coordinating the work of existing CIO and AFL unions of library workers, to act as a clearing house of information and advice for these unions and to assist unorganized library employees in forming new library unions.[3] Then there was the standard stereotyped rationale at the time - and we find it with us today as well, supposedly to make the suggestions of the militants more palatable to librarians - to serve as liaison between the library movement and organized labor and, of course, to cooperate fully with the A.L.A. in helping to extend and improve library service. There was more of the same, such as - "To bring closer cooperation between organized labor and libraries, to acquaint the trade movement with the services and resources of the public libraries and to make known to the library profession the needs and desires of 10 million organized workers."[1] It wasn't an effective line then and it isn't now.

---

[1] Lynn Aschbrenner li.brar'i.an. Copyright November 1944, by American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, A.F.L.

[2] ALA Bulletin XLII (September 15, 1968), P74-6.

[3] ALA Bulletin XLIV (May 1950), 193.

LURT had an amazingly uninteresting history with completely blah results. It was a bore. The impression it made on librarians throughout the country was comparable to that caused by a slow yawn on the other side of the world. LURT met at the A.L.A. conventions in 1940, 1941, 1942, 1944, 1946, 1947 and 1948. This Round Table was hardly rich in vigorous leadership, and did little but set up information booths at the conventions where pamphlets and the newsletters of library unions were distributed. The shock waves were not great. But, then, what could be expected of a group that in 1940 passed a resolution urging President Roosevelt to keep America out of the war?[2] And in 1942 when there was a new line-up in the war, LURT pointed out, " . . . the first duty and responsibility of every library and librarian is to exert full energies toward helping to win the war against the Fascist Axis."[3] In view of this type of devotion to high ideals, we needn't be surprised that whatever little activity there may have been in LURT with regard to the unionition of librarians, decreased rapidly until there was a one line reference in the A.L.A. Bulletin for 1952, repeated in 1953, "The Library Unions Round

---

[1] ALA Bulletin XXXV (September 1941), P119-23.

[2] ALA Bulletin XXXIV (August, 1940), P153.

[3] ALA Bulletin XXXVI (September 15, 1942), P104-8.

Table is in the process of reactivation,"[1] and, then, in 1954 - oblivion.

So far as we can learn from the literature, the A.L.A. had no further truck with unionization until 1968 when the new President, Roger McDonough, delivering his inaugural address at the end of the convention before only 800 or 900 of the 6,500 delegates who had attended the convention, recognized that library unions "have begun to move into a vacuum that we have, by inaction, helped to create."[2] Mr. McDonough then announced a program to determine what is and what is not being done for the welfare of librarians and to plan remedial action, a general conference program for the 1968 convention at which the "whole problem of professional associations versus unions can be explored.[3] Mr. McDonough, in a letter to me[4] said that a special program on this subject (organization of professional librarians for the purposes of collective representation) is being planned for the Atlantic City Conference this fall. In his speech, however, he proceeded to spoil a good deal of what he had said by continuing: "I am not against unions per se; I don't feel that unions can, or will, exhibit the same concern for the profession that we do."[5]
Mr. McDonough and the A.L.A. have missed the point: The unions are not supposed to be concerned with the profession; the job of the union is to be concerned with the librarian and to secure for him more money, better working conditions, an improved image and greater security. It's up to

---

[1] ALA Bulletin XLVI (December, 1952), 411. ALA Bulletin XLVII (December, 1953), 573.

[2] Library Journal XCIII (August, 1968), 2807.

[3] ALA Bulletin LXII (July/August, 1968), 873.

[4] Letter from Roger H. McDonough, President A.L.A., and Director, New Jersey State Library, September 4, 1968.

[5] ALA Bulletin LXII (July/August, 1968), 873.

A.L.A. to be concerned with the profession and the professional aspects of librarianship and to do something about it. But that's another subject.

On October 4, 1976, American librarians will celebrate the centennial of the American Library Association. Usually, in connection with such an event, the organization doing the celebrating gets somebody of prominence to write its history, distributes it to stockholders or the membership and to all libraries free of charge, which is just about what it is worth in most instances. On the other hand, the organization could use the occasion to take a good hard look at what it may have accomplished over the century, or at where it has failed, as well as at where it is heading and should be heading. Even better, the organization might engage a completely objective research group to do the study and point the directions to be taken. In preparation for its centennial, ALA should have a serious study undertaken on its behalf, with particular regard for the growing strength of unions in the field of librarianship. The 1976 convention of ALA could be interesting.

State Library Associations

Even as conservative an observer as Keith M. Cottam says there is a "definite need for statements of policy from Library Associations." Altogether against unions, he is in favor of "strong, vigorous, professional associations at the local, state and national levels, with backbone to defend the rights of librarians, for what may be the most acceptable alternative for those who would prefer collective action."[1] The trouble is that we have heard this cry to the Library Associations before this and nothing has happened. If the Associations don't move now they may well find that they have blown their last opportunity. A survey of State Library Associations reveals that they are doing very little.

On October 4, 1968, a letter was sent to the Presidents of the State Library Associations. 25 replies were received. No reminders were sent. The letter said, in part:

> I have learned that a growing number of librarians are joining unions or other organizations for the purposes of collective representation and that some states have passed special laws in order to permit government employees to join unions and in some cases to require government departments to negotiate with such bodies.
>
> Collective representation and collective bargaining are highly complex operations and most library staffs hardly have the resources to act independently in this type of project. It is likely, therefore, that library staffs of independent libraries would turn to their state associations for advice and guidance and for even more direct intervention.
>
> I would appreciate your advising me whether your association has considered the role as either an advisory body or possibly as a bargaining agent for any of the library staffs in your state interested in bargaining collectively and, if so, what decision has been reached, what action has been taken to implement the decision and what results have been achieved.

---

[1] Keith M. Cottam. "Unionization is not Inevitable, "Library Journal, XCIII (November 1, 1968), 4105.

"Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization." 16

The following State Associations replied that they had not given the subject any consideration.

Arizona
Delaware
Florida
Hawaii
Idaho
Kansas
Kentucky
Maryland
Missouri
Montana
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Pennsylvania
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Virginia
West Virginia
Wisconsin

The following replied they were either studying the problem or planned to study it:

Connecticut
New Hampshire
New Jersey

The following replied that they had considered the subject but were doing nothing about it:

Massachusetts
Michigan

With regard to Massachusetts, it is interesting to note that it has a "collective bargaining" law obliging state bodies to bargain collectively with employees who organize for that purpose. The Public Library Administrators Division of the Massachusetts Library Association conducted a survey in 1967 and learned that "collective bargaining activity among city and town employees, exclusive of teachers, was reported in 64 communities. In 11 of these, the library staff was either all or partially organized." Partial organization occurred in 7 libraries and the organiza body was the AFSCME. In 4 libraries where the complete library staff was organized, 2 were organized by the local city or town employees association, 1 by a local library staff association and 1 by AFSCME.

47% of the Head Librarians thought that an established state or national library association would be the most appropriate organization to represent library employees in collective bargaining. The remaining half almost equally divided between a local library staff association and a local city or town association. 2% chose an established industrial union.

55% believed that the Massachusetts Library Association should provide a full range of assistance relative to the collective bargaining law.[1]

So what happened? According to Joseph S. Hopkins, to whom my letter addressed to the President of MLA was referred: "At this moment there is no official position of the MLA in regard to the Association assuming the position of bargaining agent for Massachusetts Public Libraries." Mr. Hopkins guessed "that the librarians in the larger cities will affiliate with an existing national association such as the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees because they have the wherewithal." One explanation for this, according to Mr. Hopkins, is that the dues would be prohibitively high if the MLA were to assume a function in collective bargaining.[2]

Michigan Library Association considered the matter in 1966 and decided that its members would be better off joining with the municipal employees in their communities for the purpose of collective bargaining "rather than using MLA as a bargaining agent." It was thought questionable whether MLA would or could be as effective as a strong local union.[3]

---

[1] Massachusetts Library Association. Public Library Administrators Division. "Findings from questionnaire survey on the impact and implications of the Massachusetts 'collective bargaining' Law on public libraries," May 15, 1968.

[2] Letter from Joseph S. Hopkins, Director, Watertown Free Public Library, October 25, 1968.

[3] Letters from W.J. Kimbrough, President, Michigan Library Association, October 11 and October 22, 1968.

There's your answer, Mr. Cottam! In so far as collective bargaining is concerned, the library associations are blowing it. And, as a matter of fact, they are, unfortunately, providing the membership with no alternative but to join unions. What I'm afraid of is that the associations are not going to do anything at all with regard to the position of the librarians or even with regard to library service in the community and will leave the entire bundle in a vacuum to be filled by the union.

Current Status of Library Unions

Up until very recently there was little hope of organizing libraries for the purposes of collective representation. Certainly until this decade nobody gave any thought at all to having a union act as an exclusive bargaining agent on behalf of librarians. In the first place, note must be taken that as a general matter public libraries are exempt from the Wagner Act and are not legally obliged to recognize any organization as having exclusive bargaining rights on behalf of employees even if every single employee in the public library were a member of the union. Secondly, almost all of the large libraries are affiliated with a branch of the government and until very recently government employees did not have the right to join unions for the purpose of collective bargaining. Actually, there are still many states where such activity may not be legal.

The first library unions, with librarians, were in the following five libraries, all in the east and all affiliated with the AFL:

The New York Public Library - May 1917
The Library of Congress - September 1917
The Boston Public Library - May 1918
Washington, D.C. Public Library - October 1918
Philadelphia Public Library - June 1919

None of the unions formed at these libraries, except for the Library of Congress, lasted beyond the early twenties. The union at the Washington Public Library seems to have been the most successful because, it is said, it went out of business when it had met all of its objectives in connection with the reclassification of positions and salaries. Berelson indicates that the leadership of the unions in Boston, New York and Philadelphia was not very good.[1]

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

Then in the 1930s, evidently arising out of the unusual economic depression, the loss of jobs, low pay, payless furloughs and the closing of libraries, there was a rebirth of union activity in libraries and by 1939, according to Berelson, there were unions in the following libraries:

Library of Congress - two unions

Butte, Montana Public Library - 1934

Cleveland Public Library - 1937

Milwaukee Public Library - 1937

Chicago Public Library - 1937

Grand Rapids Public Library - 1937 (inactive in 1939)

During the 1940s there were unions present in nine libraries, as follows:

Atlanta Public Library[1]

Washington State Library[2]

Library of Congress (2 unions)

Boston Public Library[3] - 1943

Detroit Public Library[4] - 1949

New York Public Library[5] - 1940

Chicago Public Library[6] - 1937

---

[1] ALA Bulletin XLI (September 15, 1967), 77-81.

[2] W.P. Tucker, "Unionization for Special Libraries," Special Libraries, XXX (February, 1939), 41-5.

[3] Lynn Aschbrenner, li.brar'i.an.

[4] Letter from Arthur M. Woodford, Assistant in the Personnel Office, Detroit Public Library, August 27, 1968.

[5] C.P.L. Union News (Chicago), IV (January/February, 1940).

[6] C.P.L. Union News, (September, 1938).

Cleveland Public Library[1] - 1937

Milwaukee Public Library[2] - 1937

We now have the following seven libraries either operating under collective bargaining agreements with unions and including librarians or in the course of negotiating such agreements with unions designated as sole bargaining agents:

Detroit Public Library
Brooklyn Public Library
New York Public Library
Queens Borough Public Library
Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County
The Free Library of Philadelphia
Milwaukee Public Library

There are also unions at at least the following 14 public libraries:

Contra Costa County (California) Library
Fresno County Free Library
Los Angeles Public Library
Los Angeles County Public Library
Oakland Public Library
San Francisco Public Library
Chicago Public Library
Enoch Pratt Free Library (Baltimore)
Grand Rapids Public Library
Minneapolis Public Library
St. Paul Public Library
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

[2] Letter from Vivian Maddox, Assistant City Librarian, Milwaukee Public Library, October 17, 1968.

Cleveland Public Library

Milwaukee Public Library

and at the following three government libraries:

Library of Congress

Department of Interior Library

Washington State Library

There are also unions with librarians at the following universities:

City University of New York

University of Pennsylvania

University of California at Berkeley.

Public Libraries

Operating Under Collective Bargaining Agreements

MICHIGAN

Detroit Public Library

Here we have today, not one, not two but three - count them - three collective bargaining agreements covering different groups of employees of the Library. One with which we need not concern ourselves in this paper, except to note for the record, is the contract for clerical and maintenance personnel concluded with the Detroit Library Commission by Local 1259, District Council 77, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.[1] The second is the contract covering "Pre-Professional - Assistant Chief of Library Department" - including Library Pre-Professional Assistant, Librarian I, Librarian II, Librarian III, Assistant Chief of Library Department and Semi-Senior Accountant - entered into between the same Local 1259 and the Detroit Library Commission as of May 7, 1968 and in force until October 31, 1969.[2] The third is the contract between the Detroit Library Commission and the Association of Professional Librarians of the Detroit Public Library running from July 1, 1968 to July 1, 1971, covering all Chiefs of Departments, Chiefs of Divisions, and Coordinators of major activities employed by the Detroit Library Commission.[3]

Librarians and other employees covered by the AFSCME contract now come under an agency shop provision recently approved by the Detroit City Council. "The employees may join the Union or pay a service fee equal to Union dues. The deadline for fulfilling this requirement is January 2, 1969 and failure to do one of the above will lead to severance from the Library payroll.[1]

---

[1] Agreement dated May 7, 1968 between the Detroit Library Commission and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, Local 1259, District Council 77.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Agreement dated June 25, 1968 between the Detroit Library Commission and the Association of Professional Librarians of the Detroit Public Library.

Excluding the usual patter about recognition of librarianship as a profession, the paramount responsibility of the Library Commission in the operation of the library system, responsibility toward each other and the community, and so on, the following are some of the main points in the agreement between the Commission and the Association of Professional Librarians of the Detroit Public Library covering Chiefs of Departments, Chiefs of Divisions, Coordinators of Major Activities, and the Chief of The Technology and Science Department:

1. The Association is recognized "as the exclusive representative for the purpose of collective bargaining in respect to conditions of employment."

2. Under "responsibilities and prerogatives of supervisors" are noted that the ultimate decision for promotions and transfers (of librarians and full time clerks) resides solely with the administration; that there shall be regularly scheduled meetings at least twice a year of all supervisors and top administrators for the purpose of more adequate two-way communication.

3. Promotions procedure notes that vacancies above Division Heads shall be posted for seven calendar days prior to filling the position permanently with the usual statements of qualifications required to be on file in each library agency, promotion to be by merit based on consideration of professional background and attainments with length of service as only one of the factors to be reviewed.

4. After seven years of continuous service application may be made for sabbatical leave of six months to one year. Staff members on sabbaticals to be paid on a one-half salary rate basis with no vacation accruing during the sabbatical leave.

---

[1] Letter from Arthur W. Woodford, Assistant in the Personnel Office, Detroit Public Libfary, November 29, 1968.

5. Grievances (conditions considered to be in violation of the agreement) are handled in a four step procedure: a) to the immediate superior; b) Association Grievance Committee meets with the Personnel Director; c) Association meets with the Library Director; d) The Library Commission. There are the usual strict time limits involved in that no grievance shall be processed unless presented within seven working days of its occurrence or knowledge of its occurrence as well as with regard to going from one step to the next.

6. The agreement establishes a committee representing the Association and the employer for the purpose of reviewing and formulating a procedure and guide lines for preliminary interviews, employee ratings and such other employee review.

7. Sick leave, leave of absence, hospital and life insurance, holidays, vacations, longevity pay, pensions and wages are as specified in the current regulations (containing nothing of particular significance) and therefore not spelled out in the contract, but it is agreed that any improvements negotiated with the City of Detroit will be added to the agreement. At the same time, note is taken in the agreement that the Association will cooperate with the Commission "in every way possible to gain improvements in each of these areas, especially wages."

The agreement entered into with Local 1259 governing the Pre-Professional - Assistant Chief of Library Department group, is much more detailed and is one of the most comprehensive in existence. In this case too the union is recognized as the exclusive representative for the purpose of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of work, and other conditions of employment. The contract also contains an article on union security providing that members of the union shall be members for the duration of the agreement. The following are other main provisions of the agreement:

1 Dues check-off.

2. Grievance (an event or condition considered to be in violation of the contract) procedure provides for four steps: a) Union steward with the employee's immediate supervisor; b) Union to the Personnel Director; c) Union to the Library Director; d) Arbitration with Union and Employer agreeing on a mutually acceptable arbitrator, otherwise selection of an arbitrator by rules and procedures of the American Arbitration Association. In the course of the entire procedure no employee is required to meet with any superior without Union representation.

3. The Library must make available to the Union copies of all notices and directives of library-wide distribution or affecting employees within the bargaining unit, including the proceedings of the Detroit Library Commission and the D.P.L. Register, and a copy of the budget after approval by the Commission, among other things.

4. New positions requiring new classifications and salaries to be discussed with the union.

5. No strike, work stoppage or slowdown - No lockout.

6. Six months probationary period for new employees may be extended another six months.

7. Seniority is defined "as the length of continuous service as determined on the job classification basis in accordance with the employee's last date of hire."

8. 15 days notice in writing must be given before intended effective date of discharge. The employee and the union may discuss the matter with the employee and have the right to appeal the discharge through the grievance procedure.

9. Lay-off, being a reduction in the working force, is strictly in accordance with seniority although "in proper cases, exceptions may be made." Recall also on the basis of seniority. Stewards in the event of lay-off

shall be continued at work as long as there is a job in their classification which they can perform and Local union officers shall be continued at work at all times provided they can perform any work available.

10. Transfers, as a practical matter, can be made by the Library whenever the needs of the service demand.

11. Promotions call for the posting of a job and employees may apply, the promotions being based on the employee's ability to perform the job and seniority. A senior applicant who disagrees with the reasons for the denial of his request for promotion has access to the grievance procedure.

12. Normal work week of 40 hours including 45 minutes meal period and 20 minutes rest period which brings work week down to 34 hours 35 minutes. Employees on the afternoon shift, starting at 2:00 p.m. or later get a pay premium of 3%.

Overtime pay at time and a half for all hours worked over eight hours in a day (including the meal break), and all hours in excess of the normal work week, for work on Sunday. When an employee is called back to work in excess of his regular shift he is guaranteed at least four hours work or pay at time and a half. Overtime at double time for work on the seventh day of the normal work week and on holidays.

13. Seven paid holidays plus two swing holidays. Any employee who has to work on a holiday gets double time, minimum being two hours.

14. Leaves of absence without pay granted without loss of seniority for, among other things, serving in the Peace Corps, continuing education with direct relationship to library position and serving in an exchange or other library position for a limited term. These leaves are granted for reasonable periods not to exceed one year but extendable to two years.

Leaves of absence with pay are available to employees who attend Library conventions, but these must be approved.

Sabbatical leave for professional and educational development may be granted for six months to one year after seven years of continuous service at one-half salary.

Military leave granted with accrued seniority while in the armed forces. Reservists paid the difference between reserve pay and regular salary with the library while on active duty.

15. Vacation - an employee who becomes ill and under a doctor's care during his vacation for more than three days can charge such days to sick leave. In the event illness or other conditions prevent an employee from taking his vacation he shall be paid all vacation credits or allowed to take vacation at a later time. Annual vacation prorated up to twenty working days.

16. Sick leave accumulates at one day for each month with a maximum accumulation of 125 days. In addition, five reserve sick leave days for each year of service which may accumulate to a maximum of 125 days. Employees may charge up to five days against current sick leave for personal business and non-illness emergencies, such as religious holidays. Upon retirement, disability or death, payment will be made for one half of unused sick leave not to exceed thirty days.

17. Longevity pay - Upon completion of ten years, two per cent with minimum of $100 and maximum of $150. Upon completion 15 years, four per cent with a minimum of $200 and a maximum of $300.

18. Blue Cross - Blue Shield for employee and his legal dependents, plan M-75, Ward Coverage PlansB, C and D or Community Health Associates.

19. The general retirement system of the City of Detroit.

20. Life Insurance as provided by the City Employees Benefit Plan under theDetroit City Charter, as well as voluntary group life insurance available up to a maximum of $10,000 for salary range $10,000 and over.

21. Tuition refund to employees with more than three years standing for courses related to the field in which the Librarian is working provided there is approval from Personnel Director, funds are available and the employee continues work one year after completion of the courses or repays money given to him.

Since the Detroit contracts are particularly comprehensive, consideration should be given to the following items:

1. It is interesting that in a library of this size and complexity, it was felt necessary to write into the contract that semi-annual meetings be held of all supervisors and top administrators. This was apparently inserted at the request of the Association covering this group of employees. The supervisors may have felt that they were not being given adequate direction or not consulted regarding the formulation of policy. This could be a first step toward greater participation by librarians in the management of the Library.

2. Promotions are left strictly and firmly in the hands of the Library administration as spelled out in the contract with the Association. In the case of the Union, however, the promotion procedure indicates that the library has little option but to promote within the ranks as long as the senior person applies for the opening, otherwise the matter can go to grievance which can prove to be terribly burdensome.

3. Sabbatical leave provisions in both contracts are a start although, confined to half salary regardless of length of leave, it is not likely that many people will feel able to take advantage of the sabbaticals. This, however, is the kind of thing that establishes a precedent and serves as a basis for negotiating future contracts and perhaps doing better.

4. The Associatbn-Management committee to review certain personnel matters is very important because it brings the union into the field of hiring practices, promotions and related matters.

5. The paragraph in the Association contract calling for cooperation between the Association and the Commission to gain improvement in various areas, particularly wages, is unique and therefore of particular interest. In effect it calls on the union and the administration to get together and pressure the city. Don't think badly of this, Virginia; after all, there is no reason why professional librarians should not combine with library administrations and present a common front to the fiscal and other authorities for improved salaries and working conditions.

6. The arbitration and grievance procedures are established, as usual, for the benefit of the Union on behalf of the staff members and are not designed for the utilization of management. It would be extremely difficult for management to have recourse to these procedures should it feel that conditions exist in violation of the contract. Management's only practical recourse is to take unilateral action and force the Union to resort to the grievance procedure if it wishes, or into a strike.

7. The contract with the Union does not set forth acceptable reasons for discharge. Even the standard "malfeasance" clause is absent. In effect this could well mean being obliged to go through the grievance machinery any time anyone is to be discharged regardless of the reason. This places a grave burden on management and the result is that nobody is likely to be fired at any time.

8. The transfer provision in the Union contract, not demanding transfers on a seniority basis, is different from the transfer clause in most modern contracts. This one at least provides for the possibility of transferring people on the basis of need within the service as determined by the library administration. Probably next time around at negotiations this will be changed!

9. With regard to leaves of absence without pay, as provided for in the Union contract, it does not appear that the administration may exercise much discretion.

10. Payment of ½ accumulated sick leave upon retirement, disability or death is one of the most enlightened clauses of this type and may be of great benefit both to the library and the employee. It is representative of the kind of clause being adopted by libraries in order to persuade people not to stay out sick at the slightest excuse.

11. Tuition refund is definitely a plus item and it is interesting that this is in the Union contract but not in the contract with the Association.

The recent union history in Detroit starts with July 23, 1965, when Act 379 of the Public Acts of 1965 became effective. The new law declared for the first time the organization and collective bargaining rights of public employees in Michigan, provided for their enforcement, established procedures for determining collective bargaining representatives, repealed the automatic strike benefits of the former act (the Hutchinson Act) and made other significant changes in that law.[1]

Since 1949 there has been a Detroit Public Employees Union which was chartered as Local 1259 of the AFSCME. Shortly after that the check-off of dues was instituted but many union members did not choose to use this service. With the passage of the new law, Local 1259 mounted a campaign, obtained authorization cards and on April 6, 1966, was recognized as the sole bargaining agent for all clerical and production maintenance employees of the Detroit Public Library.

---

[1] Letter from Arthur M. Woodford, Assistant in the Personnel Office, Detroit Public Library, August 27, 1968. (The information that follows is based largely on this letter.)

Then, in February, 1966, a newly formed group, called the Association of Professional Librarians of the Detroit Public Library, filed for recognition as the sole bargaining agent for all the professional staff (pretty late, as it turned out) while Local 1259 filed to represent professional librarians from Pre-Professional grades through Assistant Chief of Department, and also to represent professional librarians from Division Chief through Coordinator. There was a hearing before a State Labor Mediation officer in April, 1966, and the three principals involved, including the Library Commission, presented their arguments for the division of the professional staff:

"The Library Commission, agreeing to the division between 'supervisory' and 'non-supervisory' personnel, held that Librarian XIIs who function as First Assistants and Assistant Chiefs of Departments should be included in the 'supervisory' category; Local 1259 held that First Assistants and Assistant Chiefs should be classed as 'non supervisory'; APL-DPL held that all professional librarians should be included in a single bargaining unit."

In the fall of 1966, the State Labor Mediation Board ruled that the professional staff should be divided as follows:

Unit A: All librarians employed by the Detroit Library Commission including Pre-Professional Librarians, Librarians I, II, III (area specialists and First Assistants), Assistant Chiefs of Departments, and including regular part time librarians; but excluding Chiefs of Departments and Divisions, Coordinators of Major Activities, Chief of Technology and Science Department, Director, Associate Director, Assistant Directors, Assistant in the Personnel Office, and all other employees, supervisors and executives.

Unit B: All Chiefs of Departments, Chiefs of Divisions, Coordinators of Major activities, and the Chief of Technology and Science Department employed by the Detroit Library Commission; excluding Pre-Professional Librarians, Librarians I, II, III (area specialists and First Assistants), Assistant Chiefs of Departments, Director, Associate Director, Assistant Directors, Assistant in the Personnel Office, and all other employees.

This decision, of course, actually supported the request of Local 1259 and denied the request of the Library Commission and the APL-DPL.

An election was held on January 11, 12 and 13, 1967, for representationof the professional staff. Of 214 eligible to vote in Unit A, 85 voted for APL-DPL and 103 voted for Local 1259. Of 50 eligible to vote in Unit B, 27 voted for APL-DPL and 18 for Local 1259. The Library Commission thereupon recognized Local 1259 as the bargaining agent for the"non supervisory" librarians and APL-DPL as the bargaining agent for "supervisory" librarians. Extensive negotiations followed and contracts were signed and ratified.

I would assume from the course taken by all of the negotiations that the administration of the Library might well have been anxious to see established a separate union made up of as many upper grades of librarians as possible in a separate organization for "supervisory" personnel. This is often standard procedure in cases of this kind so that in the event of a strike by a union there will be sufficient, it is thought, supervisory personnel available to man the pumps. But it did not work out in this case, one probable reason being that the APL-DPL waited much too long to get started.

NEW YORK

In New York City all money matters come under agreements with the City of New York and not with the individual library systems. District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, and the City of New York have reached an agreement on the salaries of librarians in the Brooklyn, New York and Queens Borough Public Libraries and this represents not only the first salary contract concluded on behalf of public librarians in the City of New York, with new minimums, but for the first time provides for across-the-board increases at all levels plus guaranteed minimum increases for all promotions. This agreement on salaries does not apply to librarians of Research Libraries at New York Public because they are not paid by New York City funds. The agreement, to be implemented soon, is retroactive to January 1, 1968, and will run through June 30, 1970. It provides for a minimum starting salary of $7,600 for professional librarians, as follows:

	January 1, 1968	January 1, 1969
Librarian	$ 7,600	
Senior Librarian	8,250	8,650
Supervising Librarian	9,500	9,950
Principal Librarian	10,850	11,300

The parties were supposed to agree last October on the minimum for the position of Librarian effective January 1, 1969.[1] The unions involved told me that the new base would certainly be no less than $8,200.

---

[1] Broadside issued by District Council 37, AFSCME, August, 1968.

In the New York Public Library, prior to the agreement, the minimum scales were:

Librarian	$ 7,050
Senior Librarian	7,800
Supervising Librarian	9,000
Principal Librarian	10,300

Having regard for the normal progression of salaries in the City of New York in general it would not appear that the unions have thus far achieved any significant break-through in terms of salary increases. But they are just getting started and, as Mr. Beasley indicated, they are fighting against an image. (Mr. Beasley is president of the NYPL union.)

All matters relating to vacations and sick leave and the like are spelled out in the Career and Salary Plan and Standard Leave Regulations of the City of New York and these items are not negotiable by individual unions. These items, therefore, will not be discussed in this paper.

Separate agreements governing working conditions and other related matters are the responsibility of the respective unions and individual library systems.

Brooklyn Public Library

Library Guild Local 1482, District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, as exclusive bargaining agent, has a contract with the Brooklyn Public Library dated September 15, 1967.[1] This contract covers working conditions, sets out a grievance procedure and includes a no strike no lockout clause. The agreement, which does not include salaries, covers the following grades of librarians from Librarian Trainee to Principal Librarian, with certain exceptions:

---

[1] Contract dated September 15, 1957, between Brooklyn Public Library and District Council 37, Library Guild Local 1482, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

Librarian Trainees, Librarians, Senior Librarians, Supervising Librarians and Principal Librarians except for Librarian Trainee Aide, Senior Community Coordinator, Superintendent of Branches, Assistant Superintendent of Branches, Assistant Coordinator I of Central Service, Director of Special Services, Director of Reference, Director of Finance, Coordinator of Cataloging, Coordinator of Childrens Service, Coordinator of Adult Service, Chief of Administration Service, Director of Young Teens, Coordinator of Book Ordering, and a few others. Also in the unit are professional, clerical and custodial classifications except for four confidential secretarial positions.

The following are some of the most important items in this contract:

1. The right of any employee to join or to refrain from joining the union is recognized.

2. This agreement is particularly important because it contains a management clause that spells out specific reserved rights of the Library and notes that these are excluded from the arbitration provisions of the Agreement. Some of these rights are the following: To determine its services, staffing and the schedule; introduction of new methods and facilities; to open, relocate and close any agency, and to select a location for any agency except as to the impact of such decisions upon employees; to select, hire, and assign employees; to schedule, transfer and promote employees.

3. In Brooklyn a big item is operation of the library in extreme weather conditions. This contract sets forth that when the temperature-humidity index remains at or about 80 for one hour, all staff except a minimum required to maintain service to the public shall be released. When it reaches 82 the Director's office shall be called with regard to closing that particular location.

When the indoor temperature at work location remains below 64 degrees two hours after the beginning of the work day, the Director's office shall be called for a decision about closing that work location. Staff may be transferred from a closed work location to another one.

4. Where a transfer to fill a vacancy must be made from a work location any person in the proper class of positions may be asked to transfer but it is mandatory only for the person with the least seniority in the class of positions, in the work location.

5. If, while on annual leave an employee is seriously disabled for a period of a week or more this will be charged to sick leave and the like amount of annual leave will be restored to the employee's credit.

6. Dues check-off.

7. Grievance (any dispute between the Library and the employee concerning the meaning and application and the alleged violation of the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement) procedure: Four steps beginning no later than thirty days after grievance arises: a) Employee in writing to immediate supervisor who forwards it to appropriate person; b) Employee or his representative may submit appeal in writing to Superintendent of Branches, Coordinator of Central Service or the Executive Assistant to the Director who shall conduct grievance hearing where employee may appear with or without a representative; c) Employee or his representative may submit appeal in writing to the Director; d) Union may submit written request for arbitration to the American Arbitration Association.

8. No strike - no Lockout.

9. Promotions Board with three of the non-permanent members selected by the Director and two of them selected by the Director from specified groups of employees with the concurrence of the Union.

The management clause with specific reserved right as set out in this contract is hardly S.O.P. and the spelling out of the rights would seem to point up the inherent strength evidently exhibited by the Union and worrying the administration.

It would appear that the seniority provision relating to transfers could lead to a great deal of trouble in view of the fact that in practice only those with the least seniority and, therefore, perhaps the least experience will be assigned to ghetto locations where it might be expected the most experienced and best librarians should be assigned. We could then have develop a situation similar to that existing between the teachers and the Board of Education where the best teachers are in the white, middle class districts and the most inexperienced (who need not always be the worst) are in the ghetto schools where the experienced best are really required. Mr. Brandwein, the President of the Guild, pointed out to me that this danger does not exist in the library because it is recommended, although not mandatory, that anyone refusing a transfer give two reasons for the refusal, and because the manning table which calls for representatives from different classifications in each library, and since the staff of a branch is so small one can always be certain that there will be very experienced people making up an important part of the staff. It sounds good, but I'm not so sure. I am altogether suspicious of a system that is based to a considerable extent on obliging the newest people to accept the least desirable jobs particularly when this is coupled with procedures that make it ever more difficult to remove people from the system anyway.

The contract contains no provision regarding the discharge of any employee. Conceivably, this is considered superfluous either because nobody is going to be discharged or because anyone who is discharged has recourse to the grievance procedure.

In the development of modern unionism in libraries, Brooklyn has taken the lead in establishing one of the most militant and effective union groups among librarians in this country. When Dr. Milton James Ferguson headed Brooklyn Public back in the 1930s he did not think altogether kindly of the advisability of librarians banding together in unions. He was the kind of man who believed strongly in the role of the American Library Association, of which he was President in 1938-39, and was just as convinced that unions would hurt libraries and the cause of librarianship. He was "proud that librarians have resisted the invitation to identify themselves with labor unions" and he "felt that rapid strides are being made toward a solution of these problems (unjust dismissal, adequate compensation, reasonable hours and appointment of qualified persons), . . . without resorting to the deplorable practices adopted by many organized groups."[1] Little wonder there wasn't a Brooklyn union at the time that was able to get anywhere.

On January 7, 1940, however, a union of public library employees in New York was organized by the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, CIO, at a meeting of employees of the New York, Queens Borough and Brooklyn Public Libraries.[2] This city-wide union was dubbed Local 251[3] and, while basically a New York Public Library Union, it set up a Brooklyn chapter with the following program:[4]

1. Strict application of the Schemes of Service:
    - Elimination of work out of title
    - Regular and systematic appointments from public lists of eligibles.
2. Improvement of working conditions:
    - Shorter hours.
    - Four weeks vacation.
    - Open Payrolls.
    - Improved ventilation.
3. Consolidation of the three library systems in a single New York City Public Library.
4. Improvement of library service.
5. Consistent support of the aims of progressive organized labor.

---

[1] Milton James Ferguson, Address at ALA convention 1938.

[2] C.P.L. Union News (Chicago), IV (January/February, 1940).

[3] C. P. L. Union News, IV (December, 1940).

[4] The Library Unionist, II (May,1941).

(The Library Unionist, the organ of 251 at the time, carried some interesting bits and pieces in connection with this program:

("Swing and Sway with the SCMWA" - to advertise a dance.[1] "The Yanks are NOT coming."[2] "Don't use Parmelee and Terminal Cabs." "Refuse to Patronize any movie that directly or indirectly encourages American participation in the war. There are plenty of good movies."[3])

On December 12, 1940, a committee of SCMWA met with Dr. Ferguson to discuss with him the question of organization among Brooklyn librarians and to establish a basis for negotiations.[4] Dr. Ferguson was cooperative and not only offered to send information material to members of the staff but offered to consider any problems that might be submitted to him in writing and to meet with a committee to clarify problems. But Dr. Ferguson evidently had not changed all that much after all, or had second thoughts after the committee left him, because a month later 251 was complaining that no replies had been received from Brooklyn Public Library,[5] and in June, Dr. Ferguson was reported to have declined to meet with the union and to answer mail. It was said that he refused to meet with the members of any organization whose membership lists were not public.[6]

Nothing further of importance occurred until that famous Friday, October 28,1966, when the professional librarians at BPL voted 188 to 62 to join the American Federationof State, County and Municipal Employees, and the clericals voted 372 to 68 to join.[7] This was accomplished primarily under the leadership of Lawrence Brandwein, the librarian at BPL who is President of the Local today. Just before the election the librarians got their first benefit, a reduction in the work week from 40 to 35 hours.

---

[1] The Library Unionist, I (March, 1940).

[2] The Library Unionist, I (April, 1940).

[3] The Library Unionist, I (May, 1940).

[4] The Library Unionist, I (December, 1940).

[5] The Library Unionist, II (January, 1941).

[6] The Library Unionist, II (June, 1941).

[7] K. E. Nyren, "The Brooklyn Gambit," Library Journal, XCI (December 1, 1966), 5905

In addition to pressing for better salaries, working conditions and fringe benefits we again find a library union stating its determination to achieve higher quality library service.[1] The union leaders expressed the hope that "the total program of the union will enhance the attractiveness of librarianship as a profession and hence attract more and better qualified people. Its natural result will be an overall advancing of library service and thus complement the aims of the library administration."[2] This is more likely meant to satisfy some of the older librarians on the staff.

Bargaining between the union and the administration of the library did not go altogether smoothly and on Saturday, June 24, 1967, the first major demonstration by a library union took place when members picketed the main library building in Brooklyn.[3] The reason for the demonstration was the claim by the union that the administration was dragging out the negotiations unduly. It is interesting to note, however, that this demonstration was held on the librarians' own time and that library service was not affected. Among the issues which the union claimed remained unsolved were promotion procedure, adequate compensation for emergency call-in duty, and the right of union activity in free time on library premises.

The signing of the contract on September 15th, however, did not mark the beginning of a honeymoon. When three of the officials of the Brooklyn union wrote a letter to the editor of the Library Journal,[4] John Frantz, the Director of the Library, objected that it was a "gratuitous public questioning of the motives of the library administration" because the letter referred to conditions in the library in extremely hot or cold weather as "bordering on the inhuman," and to "years of autocratic and paternalistic administration."[1] The library placed official reprimands in the records of the three officers and the executive board of the union claimed that their rights to free speech were being abridged. The matter was settled, particularly under the influence of the Brooklyn Library Council, new plans for picketing were cancelled and the Library Director agreed to rescind disciplinary action.[2] Then, in a show of unity, the Brooklyn Public Library and the Brooklyn Library Guild (the union) issued a milestone statement[3] setting forth, among other things, the responsibility of union officials to voice opinions privately or publicly and an agreement to establish channels of communication with representatives of the Library and the union to meet regularly. This, of course, provided the librarians with the right to meet with the administration and discuss matters on an equal basis.

---

[1] Library Journal, XCII (January 1, 1967), 38+.

[2] Library Journal, XCII (February 1, 1967), 508+.

[3] Library Journal, XCII (July, 1967), 2493.

[4] Library Journal, XCII (November 1, 1967), 3935.

Lawrence Brandwein, President of Library Guild Local 1482 in Brooklyn, says that the union now has 605[4] members out of atotal of about 900 employees at BPL. The fact is, says Brandwein, that there are very few exempt jobs in Brooklyn. One important point, in so far as the union is concerned, is that supervisors are members of the union on the basis that a supervisor is not the same as a policy-maker. The only people exempt are policy makers and the usual complement of confidential secretaries. Even members of the Personnel Department may now join the union. This was accomplished with the help of Mr. Herbert Haber, the New York City Labor Relations Director.

---

[1] *Library Journal*, XCIII (February 15, 1968), 695.

[2] *Library Journal*, XCIII (March 1, 1968), 933-34.

[3] *Library Journal*, XCIII (April 1,1968), 1398.

[4] See Addendum.

Mr. Brandwein said that the union now meets regularly with the administration. The union, he said, is definitely seeking a voice in the administration of the library in connection with setting policies, promotion procedures and related matters.[1]

What would Dr. Ferguson say now!!

New York Public Library

Librarians and clerks of the New York Public Library are represented by the New York Public Library Guild, Local 1930, District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, which is the exclusive bargaining agent, and a contract is being negotiated. Guards and maintenance people are represented by Local 374. Local 1930 has about 900 members, making it the largest library local in the United States.[2] All employees are free to join the union or not, as they wish. Local 1930 is now negotiating a contract with the New York Public Library to govern working conditions and related matters, and salaries for employees of the Research Libraries.[3] The Library administration said on October 10, 1968, that "the Library has recognized the union as the bargaining representative for people employed in certain categories of jobs, but no contract has yet been signed."[4]

The official "Staff News" of the New York Public Library announced last April: "District Council 37, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, has presented to the Library authorizing signatures from a narrow majority of staff members in both the librarian and non-librarian staffs in certain classification titles listed below. The Library, therefore, has agreed to have this union represent these staff in collective bargaining. This action is consistent with the Library's long established policy of permitting any member of its staff to join or not to join an organization of his own choosing, and of the Library's willingness to recognize as bargaining agent any organization which represents a majority of an appropriate unit."[1] The following librarian titles are included in the librarian group:

---

[1] Interview with Lawrence Brandwein, October 22, 1968.

[2] Letter from David Beasley, President Local 1930, October 19, 1968.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Letter from Lawrence Parke Murphy, Assistant to the Director, New York Public Library, October 10, 1968.

> Librarian Trainee, Librarian, Senior Librarian, Supervising Librarian, Principal Librarian, and in the Research Libraries, Librarian I, Librarian II, Librarian III, Librarian IV (with one exception).

While negotiations are now in progress, the Union was very late in getting its demands on the table. As of November 22, only one negotiating meeting had been held.[2] Items on the list presented by the Union include personnel files, promotion, overtime work, temporary closing and grievance procedures. According to the Union head, it is hoped to set up a labor-management committee to meet monthly. The President also notes that "our main thrust in unionization is towards recognition of librarianship as the most important educational element in the nation. . . . We are determined to change our image - and what is more important - the work which creates our image."[3]

The President of 1930 explained that the negotiating committee could not get more than it did from the City for salaries because: Librarians are regarded as unworthy of respect (value) accorded to an educator by City Officials. . . . (and) their reputation for timidity and self-negation, or . . . 'dessicated spinsterhood'." The President continued that "Union activity will make apparent the determination of librarians to become leaders and not followers in the community, . . . to be lions rather than mice."[4]

---

[1] "Staff News," New York Public Library, LVIII (April 4, 1968), 49.

[2] Telephone conversation with Robert W. Schmidt, President, Local 1321, Queens Borough Public Library, November 22, 1968.

[3] Letter from David Beasley, October 19, 1968.

[4] David Beasley, "Report to the Membership," Newsletter, (September, 1968), published by NYPL Library Guild Local 1930.

The New York Public Library was the first in this country to have a union; it was formed in May, 1917. But like the other library unions formed at this period it did not have very strong leadership and this AFL affiliated union died in the 1920s.[1] After that the library had a staff association which was rather active and in 1925 it carried on a successful campaign to get an added appropriation of $350,000 for the Library.

In January, 1935, a new independent union, called the Library Workers Union, was formed to recruit all members of the library staff and to fight the Staff Association which, said the union, dealt only with "marriages, hikes and dinners." This union composed an impressive list of demands including a minimum wage of $65. a month for pages, $150 a month for Assistant Librarians, a salary increase with every promotion, no arbitrary payless furloughs, holiday and Sunday work at time and a half, and "ventilation to be judged by the effect on the workers as well as on the books."[2]

Representatives of the Library Workers Union seemed to have an unusually good relationship with H. L. Lydenberg, the Director, and met with him often to discuss all kinds of problems. It is not possible to know how many librarians were members; but it is clear that many of the pages and stack workers were in the union. The President of the union, Harry Furness, worked in the stacks. As indicated in the Library Worker, which was published by the union, a great deal of attention was paid to the difficult working conditions in the stacks.

On May 20, 1936, the union membership voted to dissolve the Library Workers Union and to join the Staff Association. The union claimed that it had revitalized the work of the Staff Association and there was no longer any reason for it to continue in existence.

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization." The Library Quarterly IX (October, 1939), 477-510.

[2] The Library Worker (New York), January 1935.

The New York Public Library Employees Union Local 251, affiliated with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Workers of America, CIO, was organized on January 7, 1940 at a meeting of employees of the New York, Queens Borough and Brooklyn Public Libraries.[1] This was primarily a New York Public Library union and one of its successes was to persuade the New York City Planning Commission to revise its budget upward by $520,000 for public library needs.[2] Local 251 at its start was referred to as a "flourishing and aggressive union of New York Public Library Workers."[3]

Not unlike the earlier union at NYPL, 251 was a vertical organization comprising workers of all ranks. Its purpose was to gain increased wages and better working conditions, to improve library service and"to cooperate with other trade union groups in the labor movement toward a better America.[4] The union did succeed in setting up procedures with the library trustees and administrative officers who were very cooperative. For example, the union won the privilege of having its publication and announcements posted on staff bulletin boards and that was a big thing in those days. There were actually negotiations on questions of an open payroll and readjusted holiday schedules for the Reference Department. The administration of the library agreed that employees had the right to join the union.[1] There was a continuing dialogue between the union and the Board of Trustees at NYPL and the union's newspaper, Library Unionist, made it clear that it was easy to meet with the Director of the Library. By 1946, the union claimed that minimum salaries had been raised from $1,320 per annum to $1,980 in the last three years, an increase of more than $600.[2] The Library Unionist continued publication at least until April 1950.

---

[1] *C.P.L. Union News*, IV, (January/February, 1940).

[2] *C.P.L. Union News*, IV, (December 1940).

[3] H. T. Black, "Impressions of the New York Public Library," *Progressive Librarians Council Bulletin*, I (January 1940).

[4] Biography of a Library Local 1940", New York Public Library Employees Union, SCMWA Local 251 (CIO).

The 1950s and the early 1960s were quiet in so far as we can determine from the literature. But in 1967 the new union, now an AFSCME affiliate, decided to go after members, and on the basis of cards signed by over fifty per cent of the staff the NYPL decided to recognize the union without asking for an election.[3] One of the problems here, however, was that the library took the position that no staff member with supervisory responsibility could be a member of the union which would have ruled out some members of the union organizing committee. This was settled at arbitration which ruled that the supervisors could belong to the union. Full recognition of the union came in April, 1968.[4]

Queens Borough Public Library

The Queens Borough Library Guild, Local 1321 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, is the exclusive bargaining agent for employees at the Queens Borough Public

---

[1] Library Unionist, I (March 1940).

[2] Library Union Round Table," ALA Bulletin, XL (September 15, 1946) 102-7.

[3] Library Journal, XCII (November 15, 1967) 4094.

[4] Letter from David Beasley, October 19, 1968.

Library.[1] Salaries having been settled with the City of New York the Union is in the course of negotiating working conditions and other related matters with the library administration. One thing has been decided; the exclusions. There are a lot more than in Brooklyn. For example, 12 Principal Librarians, including four Regional Librarians, are excluded. The tendency here on the part of the Board of Trustees is obviously to keep out of the union a group of people who might, in a strike situation, keep the library going anyway. This is a throwback to the thirties.

Having charged the Library administration with delaying tactics in concluding an agreement, the Union conducted a demonstration on Saturday, November 9, 1968, in front of the main building of the Queens Borough Public Library, complete with pickets and signs. As in the case of the Brooklyn demonstration, this one was conducted on the employees' own time and was not designed to disrupt library service. The 200 pickets included about 25 people from Queens and the rest from Brooklyn and New York.

Immediate results were claimed in that during the week following the Library administration gave the demands of the union a great deal of consideration which brought about significant progress at a two hour negotiating meeting on November 19th where the Union claims it obtained agreement on a number of important points. Even more important, as far as the Union is concerned, is that the Union is now bargaining directly with the Assistant Chief Librarian and not with the Library's attorneys who are now at the table only as advisers.[2]

---

[1] Letter from John W. Kunkel, Assistant Director of Personnel, Queens Borough Public Library, September 5, 1968.

Letter from Robert W. Schmidt, President, Local 1321, received September, 1968.

[2] Telephone conversation with Robert W. Schmidt, November 22, 1968.

The negotiations over a list of demands presented by the Union, including many detailed items not pertinent to this review, continue. The following, however, are some of the items relating to librarians which the Union seeks:

1. 35 hour week; time and a half for all work over 40 hours; double time for Sunday.

2. Employees called for emergency work to be paid minimum of four hours at overtime rates.

3. 5% differential between 6:00 PM and 8:00 AM.

4. Grievance procedure in three steps with binding arbitration as last step.

5. Library to provide Welfare Fund $60 per annum effective January 1, 1968 and $85 per annum effective January 1, 1969 for all employees covered by the contract, to be used for health insurance purposes decided by union members.

6. Labor-management committee to meet monthly.

7. Minimum standards of the American Library Association, particularly with respect to workloads, to be put into force.

8. With regard to working in extreme weather conditions, request is similar to Brooklyn's except Queens Borough calls for release of most staff at temperature humidity index of 78 and a call to the Director at 80. In cold weather Queens sticks with Brooklyn and calls for action at indoor temperature of 64.

9. Illness during vacation to be charged to sick leave provided the inability to work lasts for five working days or the employee is confined to his home by a doctor.

10. Priority in vacation scheduling on basis of seniority within title in the work location.

11. Unlimited accumulation of sick leave, and employees entitled to one day of terminal leave for every two days of sick leave up to a maximum of 100 days.

12. Annual leave taken in units of one-half hour.

13. The Library to be closed for Good Friday, two days Rosh Hashana and for Yom Kippur.

14. An employee who has used up his sick leave allowance may at his option request to go on leave without pay before using up his annual leave fund.

15. Job specifications to be created where they do not exist, or modernized where they do exist, the Union having an opportunity to review them before they are issued.

16. Involuntary transfers to be made only in reverse order of seniority in title, with seniority in the region to govern.

17. No regular scheduling of split schedules. Employees assigned to work in split schedules for temporary emergency purposes, which shall not exceed five working days, to receive time and a half for all parts of such split schedules.[1]

Most of the above demands are altogether reasonable but it is significant to note several unusual items that appear in the draft and some that don't appear at all. For example,it becomes difficult to relate a professional attitude to a group that asks for annual leave to be taken in units of one-half hour. It might, however, be the intention of the Union to apply this to non-professionals only, but even at that I'd have my doubts. Closing the library on Good Friday, Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur is irresponsible; libraries should be kept open on holidays. I understand the religious significance of these holidays as I do the administrative difficulties in setting schedules, but schedules for personnel should be adjusted as, indeed, they are in many places. Closing holiday clauses in contracts are just one of those fringe benefits and an item for negotiation; they have no other meaning - but it's not professional.

---

[1] Draft of demands proposed by Local 1321, AFSCME, District Council 37, Queens Borough Public Library, undated, received from Robert W. Schmidt, President, October 25, 1968.

What is even more important, however, is the item about involuntary transfers only in reverse order of seniority in title and submit that this could cause a great deal of trouble as noted in describing the item in the Brooklyn contract. Mr. Schmidt, the President of the Union, said that Queens is quite free of what may be considered rough or high crime neighborhoods, but Queens is likely to get them and librarians can be expected to prefer not working in those areas. The result, again, will be that those with the least experience may be assigned to these places because they will have the least seniority, although here again I was told that the manning tables would still guarantee proper representation of top grade librarians at all branches. I am just not that confident. Wouldn't it be better to have established a committee on transfers on which there would be representatives of both the union and the administration and break this binding knot of seniority on transfers? This is a very important matter in large cities.

And here we are led to what may be considered the most striking absence in a modern set of contract demands; the Union does not ask for an opportunity to play a role in promotions. The Union has decided, evidently, to keep away from one of the most important factors in modern librarianship; the right of a librarian to be judged by his peers and not by some distant administrator. The Queens Union appears to be timid also because while it would like to review new job specifications it does not insist on the opportunity to play a role in setting up the new specifications. And, as an overall matter, there is no demand to play any kind of a role in formulating library policy. That's quite all right with me because I don't think that is a union's business anyway, but I am not sure that the librarians in Queens are doing anything, through any channel, to influence library policy.

And there is no demand by the Union that overtime work is not mandatory, so far as the list is concerned.

Union activity here has a very short history. Local Union 251 organized by library employees in New York City on January 7, 1940, was said to have included Queens Borough employees[1] but there doesn't seem to be anything to support this. The Library Unionist, organ of the New York Public Library employees union Local 251 hardly mentions Queens Borough.

By 1967, District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees had become very active but in this case the Uni was facing a Board of Trustees that not only didn't crumble in the modern tradition but was a throwback to the industrial Boards of Directors of the early thirties. The Queens Borough Board did not want to deal with a Union, did not have to deal with a Union and did not want to have anything to do with the Union's representatives. Until the demonstration last month, despite the fact that the Union had been formally recognized and was engaged in negotiating a contract with the Library, the Union's representatives were not given an opportunity to bargain with any member of the Board of Trustees or the administration but they had to negotiate with attorneys engaged by the Board of Trustees.[2] In January, 1967, the Trustees simply notified the staff they would not accept union representation of the staff ecause "the Board of Trustees feels that recognitionof a Union would not e in the best interests of the library,its staff and the public."[1] This, in 1968! They need a new publicity writer. The negotiators for District Council 37 were so fascinated by the archaic situation here that they brought people in to witness the negotiations as a scientist might go to New Guinea to study a primitive tribe. One possibility is that the Board of Trustees was preparing for the tactics of harassment sometimes employed by a Union when it achieves power. This is a way of serving notice in advance that two can play at this game. The interesting thing here, of course, is that the Board of Trustees of a public library in New York is not required to recognize a union even if the union were to have every single employee signed up. On the other hand, the employees could bring pressure to bear either through demonstrations or protestations through the City government which controls the money.

---

[1] C.P.L. Union News, IV (January/February 1940).

[2] Interview with Robert W.Schmidt, President, Local 1321, October 25, 1968.

A change of heart occurred when the City of New York indicated to the Board of Trustees that it was the policy of the City of New York to recognize union representation of its employees (in New York the librarians are employed by the library systems which are quasi-public corporations but are paid by the City of New York). The Trustees then announced quite suddenly that there would be an election April 11, 1967, on the question of representation by a labor union.[2] All staff were permitted to vote, except for three top employees, and all voted in one group rather than divided along professional non-professional and clerical lines. The staff voted by a substantial margin to be represented by a union.[1] The AFSCME claimed that it now represented the library employees but the Board of Trustees said the vote meant merely that the staff favored some kind of union representation.

---

[1] Library Journal, XCII (February 15, 1967), 722.

[2] Library Journal, XCII (April 15, 1967), 1557.

The AFSCME union then proceeded to get designation cards from staff members. About 56% of the professionals indicated that they wished to join plus about 60% of the others who were counted in a separate group.[2] According to Library Journal, of "319 professional librarians eligible, 169 or 53% signed for the union. Among all other employees, of 525 eligible, 331 or 63% signed.[3]

OHIO

The Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County

The Federation of Library Employees (not affiliated) was organized on January 1, 1968, and a contract is being negotiated with the library.[4] As of November 26, 1968, however, the contract had not yet been finalized.[5]

The staff of this library system voted 126 to 23 to designate its staff association, the Federation of Library Employees, as its sole bargaining agent. David W. Griffith, the Director of the library, agreed to deal with the new union.

---

[1] Library Journal, XCII (May 1, 1967), 1783.

[2] Interview with Robert W. Schmidt, President, Local 1321.

[3] Library Journal, XCIII (April 15, 1968), 1570.

[4] Letter from David W. Griffith, Director, Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County, October 15, 1968.

[5] Letter from David W. Griffith, November 26, 1968.

Librarians up to and including Department Head are eligible to join the union as well as other classes of employees although some of the top people in administrative posts are exempt. Professional librarians hold leading positions in the union.

Library Journal reported "general agreement that the union will deal only with salaries and working conditions and not with library policies or administrative matters."[1]

PENNSYLVANIA

The Free Library of Philadelphia

There is an overall contract between the City of Philadelphia, of which the Free Library is a component part, and District Council 33, American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, which is the exclusive bargaining agent. The current contract, which went into effect February 20,1968,[2] is based on the 1961 contract.[3] The earlier contract was entered into under special enabling legislation passed by the Council of the City of Philadelphia in April, 1961, permitting the establishment of a modified union shop for city employees.[4] It is to be noted, therefore, that the librarians and other library employees of the Free Library of Philadelphia fall within the collective bargaining contract between the City and the Union for all City employees. There are no special provisions in the contract for library employees. The following are some of the main points in the contract:

---

[1] Library Journal, XCIII (March 15,1968), 1090.

[2] Agreement between the City of Philadelphia and Philadelphia District Council 33, AFSC&ME affiliated with AFL-CIO, effective February 20, 1968.

[3] George L. Gardiner, "Collective Bargaining, Some Questions Asked," ALA Bulletin, LXII (September, 1968), 973.

[4] Bill No. 656.

1. 40 hour work week; 5 days; 8 hours each Monday through Friday.

2. Wages in accordance with the Pay Plan of the Civil Service Commission and the Administrative Board of the City of Philadelphia.

3. Time and a half for any work after completing eight hours. For work on first regularly scheduled day off, time and a half, as well as double time for work on second regularly scheduled day off.

4. Those with salaries between $8,336 and $11,608 may receive overtime but at the rate of $8,336 per annum. They may, however, elect time off on an hour for hour basis for overtime work; that is, compensatory time off.

5. Overtime is not mandatory except in the case of situations affecting public health and safety.

6. Call back time - employees called back for overtime to be paid for at least four hours.

7. Night shift differential between 4:00 PM and midnight, 5 cents per hour.

8. Sick leave accumulated at 1 2/3 working days each month up to 200 days.

9. 13 paid holidays and pay at time and a half on those days.

10. Vacation earned 5/6 days a month for those less than nine years service, and 1¼ days a month for those with more than nine years, which makes it 16 days a year. No accumulation of more than 30 days permitted.

11. Layoffs in inverse order according to seniority.

12. Health and welfare plan calls for $180 a year payable to the Union for each employee.

13. Life insurance - $2,500.

14. Pension and retirement according to the Municipal Retirement system.

15. Grievance procedure: a) Union representative and the immediate supervisor of the employee; b) union representative and the personnel officer; c) Union representative and the head of the particular department; d) Union representative and the Personnel Director of the City of Philadelphia; e) Advisory Board of six members, three named by the Personnel Director and three by the Union; f) A seventh member selected by the six to act as Chairman and the decision reached by vote considered advisory only.

16. Dues check-off.

17. No strike - no lockout.

The above, of course, is an overall contract covering all employees of the City of Philadelphia so that under the circumstances we cannot apply the same criteria we would to a contract negotiated specifically for professional librarians. Thus, we cannot at this point discuss the involvement of professional librarians in the formulation of policy in the library. I have not yet been able to learn of any trend or action at the Free Library of Philadelphia toward the development of a separate professional organization that might be interested in extending library service or improving the conditions of the librarians.

As for the history of the movement in Philadelphia, the Public Library here was one of the first to have a union, one having been formed in the city in June 1919,[1] but it did not last beyond the early 1920s. Available literature reveals nothing after that until the 1960s.

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

The legislation passed in 1961 in Philadelphia provided for mandatory, voluntary and prohibited classifications of employees in terms of union membership. The decision as to the assignment of an employee to one of these groups is left to negotiation between the City and the Union. Nyren pointed out that the voluntary classification"is open to librarians who are not supervisory personnel."[1] Gardiner said that the voluntary classification is composed of employees predominently "pre-professional, beginning professional and non-professional." Gardiner went on to say that, according to the Director of the Library, "few members of the professional staff became members under this arrangement"[2] but this phrase is lifted bodily from Nyren and therefore adds nothing. In addition, however, Gardiner is all wrong about union membership in Philadelphia and Nyren isn't altogether right either unless things have changed since he wrote his article.

Actually, Librarians I, II and III are in the voluntary classifications and can join the union if they wish. This includes some Supervisory Librarians because all branch heads are LibrariansIII or IV and most of them are IIIs.[1]

---

[1] K. E. Nyren, "Libraries and Labor Unions."

[2] George L. Gardiner, "Collective Bargaining."

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Public Library

The Milwaukee Public Library Employees Union, Local 426, District Council 48, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, is included in the general collective bargaining agreement between the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee District Council 48, AFSCME, AFL-CIO. This agreement, which was signed by Local 426, among others, went into effect on January 1, 1966, and is scheduled to expire at the end of 1968.[2] There are now 144 members of Local 426 of whom 50 are professional librarians.[3]

The salary negotiations are handled for the city by its Division of Labor relations (similar to the situation in New York City) and the relations with the union of the individual city departments are concerned primarily with the implementationof the contract provisions. The signing of check-off cards has been authorized. The Library Union has a representative present at all Board meetings in Milwaukee.[4] This matter of a union representative attending regular board meetings first went into effect back in March 1938.[5]

---

[1] Telephone conversation with Miss Seyda, Personnel Department, The Free Library of Philadelphia, November 1, 1968.

[2] Agreement between the City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee District Council 48, AFSCME, AFL-CIO and its appropriate Affiliated Locals, effective January 1, 1966.

[3] Letter from Vivian Maddox, Assistant City Librarian, Milwaukee Public Library, October 29, 1968.

[4] Letter from Vivian Maddox, October 17, 1968.

[5] M. Leon, "Milwaukee Led Off," Progressive Labor Council Bulletin, II (December, 1940), 4-5.

The following are the main points in the contract:

1. Grievance procedure: a) Orally between employee and immediate supervisor either alone or with a Union representative; b) In writing to the immediate supervisor; c) In writing to the Bureau or Division Head; d) In writing to the Department Head; e) Arbitration by requesting the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board to submit a list of five arbitrators, one of which to be selected as arbitrator by both parties.

2. No strike - no lockout.

3. Vacation at one day a month for those with less than ten years service; 1½ days, with a maximum of 15 days a year, for those with ten or more years; and two days a month for those with more than 20 years service, with a maximum of 20 days annually.

4. Sick leave at 15 days a year up to 90 days "normal," and 90 days cumulative "special sick leave" from which sick leave granted at half pay.

5. 7½ paid holidays with work on these days at time and a half. Some additional days off earned by longevity.

6. Hospital and surgical care insurance for the employee and family paid for by the City with hospital care up to a maximum of 365 days.

7. Life insurance equal to employee's annual basic salary at a charge to employee of 21 cents per thousand.

8. Pensions in accordance with the City's general pension laws.

9. Overtime at time and a half in cash or compensatory time off.

10. Emergency work minimum credit three hours pay at time and a half.

11. Personnel on military leave with Reserves paid difference between Reserve and regular pay for maximum 15 days while training. Leave of absence without pay when drafted and return to same or equivalent job with seniority and salary advancement.

12. Eight hour work day, five days a week.

The Milwaukee Public Library Staff Association was organized in 1934. Two years later the Staff Association held a referendum with regard to affiliation with the AFSCME and the union group lost by a few votes. The following year, in 1937, another referendum was held and the union group won by a small majority. On September 1, 1937, the new union received its charter and"has since been recognized by the Library.[1] On October 1, 1937, the Staff Association was dissolved.[2]

The Library Employees Union, in accordance with its charter in 1937, became Chapter 14, Local 2 of the AFSCME. Miss Ruth Shapiro, the first President of the Staff Association, became the first President of the Union[3] and said that about 50% of the library staff belonged to the union in 1938.[4] Friendly and cooperative relations were maintained between the union and the administration of the Library. One way in which this was accomplished was in getting support for the Library from organized labor in Milwaukee. In this connection, the Library workers participated in an education program for workers and the Library Union together with the rest of organized labor in Milwaukee helped make it a success.[5]

The Library union in Milwaukee has always been quite active and has cooperated closely with the library administration. The union helped the Librarian to change personnel classifications and helped gain salary increases. It has also taken progressive action as, for example, appearing before the State Legislature to oppose a bill barring married women from public employment.[1]

---

[1] C.P.L. Union News, II (January, 1938)

[2] Wilson Bulletin, XII (November, 1937), 209-10.

[3] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

[4] Letter from Vivian Maddox, October 17, 1968.

[5] LURT, ALA Bulletin, (September, 1941) 119-23.

The union claimed a number of accomplishments and by 1964 it was reported that, among other things, the union had obtained a better sick leave program, increased vacations from two weeks to three weeks after ten years and four weeks after 20 years, overtime at the rate of time and a half, pension system, grievance procedure and a credit union.[2] Wisconsin passed a state law recognizing the right of public employees to organize and their right to choose by election which organization the local government should be required to negotiate with on their behalf.

In 1967, according to Nyren, there were 130 union members out of a

In 1967, according to Nyren, there were 130 union members out of a staff of 450 with all classes of the library represented.[3]

The union claimed in1967 that it had gained the best pay scale of any public library system.[4] In addition it said it had achieved time and half for Sunday and holiday work, shift differentials for evening and Saturday work, and prepaid hospital insurance as well as liberal pension benefits.

Library union members are now becoming increasingly interested in participating in actions involving promotions, transfers, reclassifications of positions and other similar items.[5]

---

[1] Erik J. Spicer, Trade Unions in Libraries (The Experience in the United States), Term paper, August 3, 1959.

[2] D. H. Moulton, Odds and Bookends, XLV (Spring, 1964), 5-8.

[3] K.E. Nyren, "Libraries and Labor Unions."

[4] Jack Golodner, "The Librarian and the Union," Wilson Library Bulletin, XLII (December, 1967), 387-90.

[5] Letter from Vivian Maddox, October 29,1968.

Public Libraries

Operating with Unions

CALIFORNIA

Contra Costa County Library

Here we have the first full-fledged strike by librarians in a major library in the United States. The Library Unit of the Contra Costa County Employees Association, Local 1675, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, struck the county libraries and put out pickets from August 22 to August 30 when about one-third of the county library employees were out. So Contra Costa County Public Library's place in history is assured. The strikers won a 5% increase, originally suggested by the

is assured. The strikers won a 5% increase,

Personnel Director and agreed to by the Board of Supervisors before the strike, plus 2½% extra for workers in lower paid classifications. The Union feels it won recognition of the right to bargain.[1]

Local 1675 was quite active in the early sixties but had gone to sleep by 1968. The Board of Supervisors of the County would not let the Union participate in wage negotiations and was not even receptive to granting the 5% increase recommended by the Personnel Director. The Union wanted a $50 increase for all employees and following mass meetings the Board of Supervisors agreed to the 5% recommendation, but by that time feelings were running high and on August 1st representatives of 1675 were authorized to strike. It must be noted that the situation in Contra Costa County is complicated to a considerable extent by an inter-union fight with Local 302 which also represents county employees and even had one librarian member, and that one, of course, eventually crossed the picket lines.

---

[1] Lois Huish, et al. "Report from the Picket Line," Library Journal, XCIII (November 1, 1968), 4107.

The main issue of the strike, according to the Union, was collective bargaining and the right of county employees to strike, as well as salary raises for lower paid employees because straight percentage raises year after year only kept increasing the spread between low and high salaries.

There is no indication that 1675 has anywhere near a majority of the staff in its membership.[1]

It is of interest to note that on August 13, 1968, the County Librarian, Bertha D. Hellum, wrote that she had referred my inquiry regarding possible union activity to a "professional member of our staff who has been Chairman of a series of informal meetings termed 'Library Unit of 1675.' This refers to members of the County Library staff who are members of the Contra Costa County Employees Association, Local 1675. . . . The only information I have is from the grapevine or the press. No informal or printed data. I understand that election for Chairman or President of the 'Library Unit' is about to be held."[2] On August 22, the library was struck. On December 2, after reading Library Journal, I wrote to Mrs. Hellum to suggest that she get a new grapevine.

Fresno County Free Library

Although, according to the Librarian, there has been no move toward organizing a collective bargaining unit here, staff members may join either the Fresno City Employees Association or the AFL-CIO Local 458.[3] Thus far, however, I have not been able to obtain any information on Local 458 despite repeated inquiries.

---

[1] Lois Huish, et al. "Report from the Picket Line."

[2] Letter from Bertha D. Hellum, County Librarian, Contra Costa County Library, August 13, 1968.

[3] Letter from Alice F. Reilly, County Librarian, Fresno County Free Library, August 13, 1968.

Los Angeles Public Library

The Librarians' Guild, Local 1634, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, formed in June, 1968, claims to represent more than fifty per cent of the librarians at the Los Angeles Public Library (approximately 170 out of 300 librarians) and more than fifty per cent of the librarians at the Santa Monica Public Library (approximately 14 out of 20). Darryl Mleynek, President of the Guild, says that the jurisdiction of his Guild covers all of Los Angeles County.[1] This would include the Los Angeles County Public Library but right now 1634 represents librarians only in the Los Angeles City Public Library and the Santa Monica Public Library.[2]

The Librarians' Guild includes professional librarians only because the group intends to be a "professional union," presumably to set it apart from non-professionals, concerned not with the traditional issues such as salary and working conditions but also with "improving communications within the library system, with fostering a professional atmosphere at all levels of work, with increasing participation in the formulation of broad policy and goals, with becoming more involved in community relations, and with increasing the freedom and independence of librarians so that they can work at their full potential." In addition, the stated purpose of the Guild is "to promote the profession of librarianship by improving salaries and working conditions . . . and by providing a forum from which members can speak to the community about the profession's services and needs."[3]

This Librarians' Guild has issued the clearest statement of any library union to become involved in library administration. Guide lines set out for the Guild include the following statement: "As professionals we feel that the formulation of policy should be a cooperative process utilizing the intellectual resources of the entire professional staff. That is what we are trained for and that is one of the obligations of being professional. As professionals, we envision our relationship to the administration as that of a group of responsible well educated colleagues dedicated to our profession of librarianship and who are only incidentally also public employees. As professional colleagues with the administration, we feel that our ideas are of value and that each of us from our vantage point in the library system has a contribution to make toward policy formulation."[1] Among the aims of the Guild:

---

[1] Letter from Darryl Mleynek, President, Librarians' Guild, Local 1634, AFSCME, Los Angeles Public Library, undated, received November, 1968.

[2] Letter from Darryl Mleynek, November 24, 1968.

[3] Library Journal, XCIII (August, 1968), 2777.

1. Horizontal advancement for Children's and Young Adult Librarians, Readers Advisers and subject specialists, as well as vertical advancement into administration.
2. Abolition of salary scales that overlap promotional classifications.
3. Participation of all librarians in establishing service priorities, evaluating new modes of service and discussing broad policy decisions.
4. Broader compensation for attendance at professional meetings and tuition reimbursement.
5. An immediate 16½% pay increase followed by salary studies and increases to a level comparable to other professionals of similar education.
6. Differential pay for both night and week-end work.
7. Professional credit for continued pertinent education.
8. 12 days sick leave annually, and four weeks vacation.
9. And the two pound wedge of Bocca Caparazzin cheese! Reimbursement of parking expenses for central library employees.[2]

A recruiting pamphlet notes that of twelve professional groups employed by the City of Los Angeles, librarians - the only class required to have a master's degree - have the lowest rate of pay. Six of these professional classifications, requiring only a B.A., have salary scales beginning at $776 a month. Two semi-professional classes requiring only two years of college or two years experience begin at $641 a month.[1] At this time salaries for "Librarian" in Los Angeles ranged from $624 to $776[2] or a beginning rate of $7,488 per annum.

---

[1] Librarians' Guild Guide Lines, mimeographed, undated.

[2] "Are you a professional," mimeographed pamphlet published by Librarians'Guild, Local 1634, AFSCME, Los Angeles Public Library, received in November, 1968.

With all of this obvious activity, the Personnel Officer of the Library in a letter to me confined himself to noting in passing that the Library has a Staff Association which is made up of both professional and non-professional employees and that "as of about two months ago we also have a Librarians' Guild, made up exclusively of professional librarians." In addition, he said that no organization at the library is recognized as the exclusive bargaining agent. All employee organizations have the right to present employees recommendations regarding working conditions, salaries and other employee benefits, but neither the Library nor the City is required to adopt any recommendation.[3]

The aspirations and aims of the Guild make up a near perfect list for a professional organization. To a great extent the list is a rationalization of the need felt by librarians to deal collectively on matters of salary and working conditions and this split personality approach carries with it the inherent danger of improving neither the lot of the librarians nor the service of the library. There's the distinct risk here offalling between two chairs. This danger is pointed up by Mr. Mleynek's further statement: "As would be expected of a union, we have become quickly involved in salary discussions,but perhaps somewhat uniquely we have also become involved in discussions with our administration on ways of improving communications."[4]

---

[1] Are you a Professional?"

[2] Monthly salary schedule, Los Angeles Public Library, July 1, 1968.

[3] Letter from Anthony F. Mafrica, Personnel Officer, Los Angeles Public Library, August 16, 1968.

[4] Letter from Darryl Mleynek, undated, received November, 1968.

Los Angeles County Public Library

According to the County Librarian, "there has not been any activity by or on behalf of the staff of the Los Angeles County Public Library to organize a collective bargaining unit, either for our professional librarians or other library employees."[1]

On the other hand, however, the Los Angeles County Employees Association includes in its membership many library employees, both professional and non-professional. This Association is provided with a voluntary dues check-off system, provides counseling for its members as well as counsel before the Civil Service Commission, conducts salary studies and makes recommendations to the Board, but does not have "as yet, any legal bargaining power to negotiate working conditions, salaries, etc., with the Board in behalf of its members."[2] In addition, there is the statement of Darryl Mleynek, President of the Librarians' Guild, Local 1534, of the Los Angeles Public Library, that the jurisdiction of the Guild includes all of the Los Angeles County area.

An Employees Relations Ordinance was adopted[3] last fall by the Board of Supervisors to cover all County employees to "provide an orderly and workable system to regulate the relations between County management and its employees, or organizations representing them." The Library is a department of County government, responsible to and governed by the Board of Supervisors. Since the adoption of the ordinance, the Personnel Officer of the Library reported there have been few concrete developments to report during this initial period.

---

[1] Letter from William S. Geller, County Librarian, Los Angeles County Public Library, August 15, 1968.

[2] *Ibid*.

[3] Letter from James R. Robb, Personnel Officer, Los Angeles County Public Library, November 4, 1968.

The following are some of the provisions in the Ordinance that may well effect the status of librarians in terms of their becoming part of a collective bargaining procedure:

1. Employees have the right to form, join an employees organization of their own choosing, or not to join.

2. The scope of negotiations between management and certified employee organizations includes wages, hours and other terms and conditions of employment.

3. A petition for certification as the majority representative of employees in an appropriate employee representation unit may be filed with the Employees Relations Commission by an employee organization.

4. In the establishment of employee representation units, professional employees shall not be included in a unit with non-professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote for inclusion in such unit.

5. The County and any certified employee organization may negotiate a procedure for handling grievances arising within the unit for which such organization has been certified.[1] The Ordinance "envisages written contract agreements between the county and the unions or associations elected by the county employees."[2]

The above would indicate considerable activity in the County of Los Angeles with regard to collective bargaining in behalf of employees and in view of this it's a safe guess that there is more activity among the librarians in Los Angeles County Public Library to organize collectively than is apparently recognized by the County Librarian or his Personnel Officer. No information on the subject has been forthcoming from a union.

---

[1] County of Los Angeles "Digest," I (August 2, 1968).

[2] Los Angeles Times, (July 26, 1968), 3.

Oakland Public Library

The personnel of the Oakland Public Library have not organized a collective bargaining unit. The Library operates in a Civil Service System and the Oakland Municipal Civil Service Employees Association pays attention to employee welfare including salaries.

The Civil Service Board recommends a scale for each classification in the Civil Service and these recommendations are circulated among employees who have the right to hearings before the Board. The City Council has consistently accepted the recommendations of the Civil Service Board.

The Charter of the City provides that the compensation of all library employees shall be set by the Library Commission. The Commission always follows the formula adopted by the Civil Service Board, with the Council providing the required fiscal support in the budget.[1]

While I have been unable to secure any information regarding the presence of a union in Oakland for librarians, or any union that has librarians among its members, the presence and type of activity followed by the Civil Service Employees Association is close enough to that of a union to place Oakland Public Library in this section of the survey.

---

[1] Letter from Peter T. Conmy, Librarian, Oakland Public Library, October 14, 1968.

San Francisco Public Library

Professional librarians at the San Francisco Public Library have not been organized in a union. There are, however, three unions or organizations in the city to which staff members do belong:

San Francisco City and County Employees Union, Local 400 (a branch of the Building Service Employees International Union), AFL-CIO.

Federation of Public Employees

Civil Service Association.[1]

The Federation of Public Employees was organized in 1932 and, with virtually all library personnel as members, acted pretty much as official spokesman for the library staff on civil service matters. When the San Francisco Public Library Association was formed it at first called on the Federation for its services but for the past three or four years the Staff Association has preferred to act independently. At the present time some 65 or 70 library personnel, of whom all but five or six are professionals, are members of the Federation.[2]

District of Columbia

Washington

Although no action has been taken by the personnel to organize a collective bargaining unit, it is assumed by the Director that some staff members belong to the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO; Local #1 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO; or other organizations. [1]

---

[1] Letter from John F. Anderson, City Librarian, San Francisco Public Library, August 13, 1968.

[2] Letter from Frank Moitoza, Jr., Executive Secretary, Federation of Public Employees, San Francisco, California, November 22, 1968.

The salaries of District of Columbia employees (except for teachers and firemen) are the same as those of Federal employees and any raises and increased benefits passed into law automatically encompass DCPL employees. For more than 25 years there has been union representation on the Board of Library Trustees. At the present time the Third Vice-President of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council is a member of the Board (loud cheers!)

Washington, it will be remembered, had one of the earliest unions - formed in October, 1918. But it went out of business when it had achieved it objectives in connection with the reclassification of positions and salaries.

ILLINOIS

Chicago Public Library

This is one of the few public libraries in the country from which it has been exceedingly difficult to obtain any hard information from the library administration despite the fact that there has been union activity here since 1937.[2] What the administration does admit, however, is "there is a union in the Chicago Public Library. It has not been designated as the collective bargaining agent; there has been no election, there is no 'agreement' with the union."[3] In addition a dues check-off system is in effect and "administration officers of the library meet with a union committee re personnel problems."[1]

---

[1] Letter from Harry N. Peterson, Director, the District of Columbia Public Library, November 22, 1968.

[2] C.P.L. Union News, December, 1937.

[3] Letter from Alex Ladenson, Acting Librarian, Chicago Public Library, October 10, 1968.

Thomas L. Beagley, the Director of District Council 19 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO in Chicago, the person to whom the Library refers persons seeking information on unionization of libraries in Chicago, is also one of those who don't like to answer mail. At the moment, therefore, we have to depend on the literature.

When the Chicago Public Library Union was organized in 1937 by representatives of the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, CIO, it was designated as Local 88. The program of the union at that time included the following points:

1. Strict enforcement of civil service for all library employees.

2. An adequate staff at all times.

3. Definite classification of duties within each grade.

4. Reclassification of grades upward to bring compensation in line with that of other city departments.

5. Minimum wage of $1,200 for all full time employees with part time based on proportional basis and time and a half for overtime.

6. Academic increases within grades.

7. Four weeks vacation with pay, and a 35 hour week (30 hour week in a long range program).

8. Proper working conditions.[2]

The President of the Union was Mr. A. B. Korman who was also active in LURT.

---

[1] Handwritten note from Chicago Public Library, October, 1963, in reply to letter sent to Alex Ladenson, Acting Librarian.

[2] C.P.L. Union News, September 1937.

Local 88 published regularly the monthly C.P.L. Union News. The union reported that it was working very hard and, according to its newspaper, until 1941 it devoted a great deal of effort to making known that "the war (World War II) is a struggle between Fascist Nazi Imperialism . . . and Franco British Imperialism and the American people don't want any part of the war."[1] This line was changed in June 1941, however, when the headlines ran: "Librarians must help win the war. It is the sacred duty and obligation of every American . . . to use all abilities and resources to help this war against Fascist barbarism.[2] Everybody has three guesses as to what caused the line change! In 1942, C.P.L. Union News began a column called "Books that lose the War," which was a very thinly disguised attempt at censorship apparently advocated by the union.[3]

By January, 1943, the employees of the Chicago Public Library had won a ten per cent increase in salary for which the union claimed credit.[4]

Bernard Berelson in his 1939 article, "Library Unionization," said that poor economic and professional conditions in the library were the reasons for the establishment of Local 88. He pointed out that in Chicago union delegates attended meetings of the Board of Trustees of the Library.[5]

In April, 1940, Local 88 had adopted a proposal suggested in the C.P.L. survey and recent studies of the A.L.A. Board on Salaries, Staff and Tenure. The Union now stressed, in addition to the 35 hour week and other staff benefits, an increase in library income to $3,400,000, modern library facilities in all sections of the city, an effective public relations program and a representative Friends of the C.P.L. organization. This list also proposed the adoption of A.L.A. classification and pay plans as a basis for C.P.L. classifications scheme.[1] This is the first time we find a union basing a demand directly on an A.L.A. recommendation.

---

[1] C.P.L. Union News, January/February, 1940.

[2] C.P.L. Union News, June, 1941.

[3] C.P.L. Union News, November, 1942.

[4] C.P.L. Union News, January 11, 1943.

[5] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

The union in Chicago continued its activity and by 1959 Erik J. Spicer was able to report that the union claimed influence in restoring automatic increases, posting of civil service lists, resumption of appointments from long standing lists, the granting of a half day off weekly for the building force, adjustments in pay rates for holiday and overtime work. Spicer also mentioned that the attendance of union delegates at meetings of the Board improved union-administration relations.[2] However, it must be noted that Berelson also referred to union delegates attending Board meetings in 1939 and I have some doubt that this practice was continued when Spicer reported it in 1959 because there is no mention of this in the C.P.L. Union News through 1945. Spicer may well have based his statement on what Berelson had written.

Relations between the library and the union have not been altogether friendly since the mid-fifties because the library administration has generally refused to deal with the union. In 1967 the union said it had 250 dues paying employees but actually claimed that a majority of the 800 employees of the library had delegated the union as their representative. At the same time, Gertrude E. Gscheidle, the Librarian, said that only about 25 members of the professional staff and 145 clerical workers were actually members of the union.[1] Having regard for the fact that Miss Gscheidle did not mention maintenance workers, both the union and Miss Gscheidle may have been right. This is part of the old numbers game in union negotiations. But there must have been some weight to the union's claim because at the end of 1965 the union did win the right to have dues check off and was allowed to make recommendations to the Library Board (although not to enter into negotiations) and this hardly would have been granted without having a substantial number of people on the staff behind the union.

---

[1] A.L.A. Bulletin, XXXIV (June, 1940), 419-20.

[2] Erik J. Spicer, "Trade Unions in Libraries."

When the Library evidently refused, early in 1967, to grant the union the right to represent its members in processing grievances as well as the right to submit suggestions for improvement of personnel practices, the union threatened a strike in March, approved by the membership, and this was averted only by the intervention of the Mayor of Chicago, Mr.Daley This intervention resulted, according to the union, in the library agreeing to the above two important concessions, and the union said it would withdraw its law suit pending against C.P.L. and postpone its scheduled collective bargaining election to await the results of a bill before the legislature to permit collective bargaining by public employees in the State of Illinois.[2] Up to now the bill has not passed the General Assembly in Springfield.[3]

A few months later, K. E. Nyren, in Library Journal, referred to the Chicago Public Library as a "disaster area in librarianship" and said that the union had "only about 200 staff members, including almost no professionals, signed up."[1] I gathered that Mr. Nyren was concerned that the union "makes no bones of its disapproval of how the Library is run" and that the members publicly criticized the operation of the Library and that recently hired "library science people" who have not worked up from clerical jobs are seen as a distinct menace by the union.

---

[1] Library Journal, XCII (April 1, 1967), 1938-39.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Letter from de Lafayette Reid, Deputy State Librarian, Illinois State Library, August 21, 1968.

By December 1967 the library workers in Chicago were able to claim a 37½ hour week, three weeks vacation after one year and certain rights of seniority.[2] If these are examples of accomplishments in December 1967 then maybe it's a disaster area after all! On the other hand it must be noted that as of January 1, 1968, a beginning librarian with an MLS started at a salary of $7,320, only about $300 less than the current New York City minimum.[3]

MARYLAND

Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore

There is a staff association that apparently concerns itself with something more than hikes and luncheons since its Board of Governors does apprach the library administration with problems relating to salaries and employee welfare. The Staff Association is represented on the General Committee of Municipal Employees, a panel made up of representatives from nine city agencies and this group drafts ordinances to introduce changes in retirement, pension and related areas of concern to the City Council. In addition, many staff members also belong to the Classified Municipal Employees Association which has been instrumental in gaining salary increases for all city employees, broadened medical benefits and overtime pay for certain employees.[1]

---

[1] K. E. Nyren, "Libraries and Labor Unions."

[2] Jack Golodner, "The Librarian and the Union,"

[3] The Chicago Public Library Schedule of Salaries, effective January 1, 1968.

The Municipal Employees Association, which "speaks for all municipal employees" says that about 100 Pratt Library employees are members.[2] I have not been able to determine how many of these people are professional librarians.

Also active in Baltimore is the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. Last July the Mayor of Baltimore announced that an ordinance would be introduced in the City Council authorizing the election of a group to have exclusive bargaining rights for city employees. The President of the Classified Municipal Employees Association, however, said he would recommend that the Association not participate in any election of an exclusive bargaining agent for city employees and that the association would most likely remain alive and run an insurance program for city workers.[3]

Under the circumstances it seems pretty clear that the employees of the Enoch Pratt Free Library are going to be blanketed under a union contract. (See Addendum)

MASSACHUSETTS

The Boston Public Library

The Boston Public Library operates under an agreement concluded between the City of Boston and the American Federation of State, County and

---

[1] Letter from Mary L. Huber, Personnel Officer, Enoch Pratt Free Library, August 16, 1968.

[2] Handwritten note from Municipal Employees Association, Inc., Baltimore, undated but received in September, 1968.

[3] Employees Sun (Baltimore), July 11, 1968.

Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, and Affiliates, effective July 5, 1967, and currently in force until the last Wednesday in April 1969.[1] This agreement, however, covers only Library Assistants, Clerical and Mechanical Services in the Library and not the professional librarians. According to Gunars Rutkovskis, Assistant to the Director of the Boston Public Library, "no election for designation of a collective bargaining agent was made. The city adopted a Collective Bargaining Law and designated the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, and Affiliates . . . ." The Director and the Associate Director, with representatives of the Personnel Office in the Library took part in the negotiations.[2] These negotiations, however, covered only the classes mentioned and not the professional librarians.

None of the professional librarians at the Boston Library are members of the union. Mr. Rutkovskis ventured the guess that the salaries in Boston, being competitive on a national level, the urge for professional librarians to unionize simply did not materialize. He added that much more initiative was shown on the part of the non-professionals, probably because they saw the chance of getting more money through unionization. He noted that the Library was altogether neutral in the matter.[3]

Massachusetts State Law says that no collective bargaining unit may include professionals and non-professionals unless a majority of the professionals in the unit agree. The professionals at the Boston Public Library evidently did not vote for the union so they are without a collective bargaining agreement.[4]

---

[1] Agreement between the City of Boston and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, and Affiliates, effective July 5, 1967 (Library).

[2] Letter from Gunars Rutkovskis, Assistant to the Director, The Boston Public Library, September 9, 1968.

[3] Telephone conversation with Gunars Rutkovskis, November 22, 1968.

[4] George L. Gardiner, "Collective Bargaining, Some Questions Asked."

The Boston Public Library had its first union in May, 1918. It was affiliated with the AFL but it did not last long and passed out of existence in a few years.[1] In 1938, the Boston Library Club was formed, at a time when many employees were receiving $12 a week. Lynn Aschbrenner, reporting in an AFSCME pamphlet said that three months after the formation of the club a $20 weekly minimum wage was established. In 1943 this group became Local 731 of AFSCME, and in June 1944, the report continues, employees of Boston Public got their regular step rate increases, the same as other city employees.[2]

1965 witnessed a rather unusual development in Massachusetts when a state law was passed under which government employees could organize for collective bargaining, and requiring City Councils and Town Meetings to pay the bills arising out of any agreements reached.[3] This is the law under which the Mayor of Boston recognized the AFSCME.

MICHIGAN

Grand Rapids Public Library

This library gave birth to a union inSeptember 1937, and it died in September 1938.[4]

It would seem, however, that unionization in the library at Grand Rapids is not altogether dead. The Director of the Library, Donald W. Kohlstedt was "happy to state that our staff have not elected to seek a bargaining agent or unionization despite three exposures and pressure from the local of the State and Municipal Employees union.[1] So there is some definite union activity here and this will be followed up.

---

[1] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

[2] Lynn Aschbrenner, li.brar'i.an, copyright November 1944 by AFSCME,AFL.

[3] K. E. Nyren, "Libraries and Labor Unions."

[4] Erik J. Spicer, Trade Unions in Libraries.

MINNESOTA

Minneapolis Public Library

The Minneapolis Public Library Professional Employees, Local 211 affiliated with District Council 3, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO. Clerical, bindery and janitorial staff members are organized as Local 99 of DC 3, AFSCME.[2] There is also a Municipal Employees Union and the library deals with various building trades unions and teamsters. A dues check-off system is in force.[3] About 80% of the 85 professional librarians are members of local 211.[4] All professional librarians and student trainees are eligible for membership except the Director and Associate Director.[5]

There is a long history of close cooperation between the library and the union although there is no formal contract.[6] For example, one delegate from each of the AFSCME locals is allowed library time for attendance at a library Board meeting. The fact that library time is granted to a professional for this purpose is not significant - these people are hardly on a factory belt - but it is altogether meaningful that the union is represented at Board meetings. In addition, the business agent of AFSCME is notified of library Board meetings as well as of selected Board committee meetings and the administration meets with the business agent plus some union members to discuss proposals that the administration will bring to the Library Board. The business agent is free to make representations to the Library Board as he wishes, either in support of or disagreement with administration proposals.[1] It all sounds too good and, anyway, why isn't there a collective bargaining agreement?

---

[1] Note from Donald W. Kohlstedt, Director, Grand Rapids Public Library, undated and received August, 1968.

[2] Letter from Mary L. Dyar, Associate Director, Minneapolis Public Library, October 31, 1968.
Letter from Robert Meyer, International Union Representative, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, St. Paul, October 1, 1968.

[3] Letter from Ervin J. Gaines, Director, Minneapolis Public Library, October 29, 1968.

[4] Telephone conversation with Leonard J. Pignatello, President, Minneapolis Public Library Professional Employees Local 211, November 5, 1968.

[5] Letter from Leonard J. Pignatello, November 7, 1968.

[6] Letter from Mary L. Dyar, October 21, 1968.

The Associate Director at the Library says that "relationships with the union have generally been workable without a contract." She also offered the possibility that some people are in the union"because they think they have some loyalty to other librarians on the staff but they just don't have a whole lot of conviction about the union.[2]

Actually, however, there just isn't as much sweetness and light in the place as we would be led to expect from the history of close cooperation between the administration and the union. The union President says that relationships are not what they were "and now it is the usual nip and tuck."[3] There must be something because in his reply to my inquiry on unionization in the library, the Library Director never mentioned the name of the librarians union and gave the whole matter the once over lightly.[4] The union head says that "collective bargaining agreements are at the top of my list . . . I'd like us to go into a contract because any informal verbal agreement is worthless."[1] But he faces some problems.

---

[1] Letter from Mary L. Dyar, October 31, '68.

[2] Telephone conversation with Mary L. Dyar, November 4, 1968.

[3] Telephone conversation with Leonard J. Pignatello, November 5, 1968.

[4] Letter from Ervin J. Gaines, October 29, 1968.

State law here does not require the Library to enter into a collective bargaining contract with a union and Leonard Pignatello, the union head, thinks he would need the enabling legislation. How about pressuring the Library to enter into a contract anyway? Well, there's some doubt as regards the true strength of the librarians union despite the majority membership. In 1955, for example, there were 155 librarians employed in the library and today there are only 85. When the local was chartered in 1947 every one of the librarians was in the union and now they are represented by 80%. The average age grouping among the professionals is "way up in the 40s" and a sizeable group of charter members may well be retiring in the next five years.[2] There would, therefore, seem to be some doubt as to whether sufficient strength could be mustered among the librarians to force collective bargaining on the library without enabling legislation. There is also some reason to believe that in view of the declining membership the international might not be altogether anxious to provide the small and independent local with the support required to force anything at all. One of these days 211 may simply have to amalgamate with 99 which includes the clericals and other personnel and then there ought to be a new ball game.

The history of union activity here goes back to about 1947.[3] The first reference in the literature to a union of librarians in Minneapolis is in the report of the Library Unions Round Table in 1947.[4]

---

[1] Telephone conversation with Louis J. Pignatello, November 5, 1968.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Letter from Mary L. Dyar, October 21, 1968.

[4] ALA Bulletin, XLI (September 15, 1947), 77-81.

At the time City Hall in Minneapolis was 100% union oriented and the librarians finally got it through their heads that in order to protect their interests they had better organize.[1] Locals 99 and 211 were set up separately because librarians are in the unclassified service and clerks and janitors are in the classified service. The two unions which were set up separately for technical reasons now continue separately because of "tradition"[2] The man who subsequently became Director of the Library was one of the charter members of the union.[3] That's one reason, perhaps, why there was a close and cooperative relationship between the union and the administration - although it could have developed just the other way.

Spicer, writing in 1959, says that employees of the Minneapolis Public Library secured benefits "but only at the expense of other budgetary items as adequate funds were not readily available." He points out that there were gains in real wages beyond cost of living increases. The things of importance that were gained included the establishment of the five days week and compensation for overtime at the rate of time and a half.[4]

From what Spicer says this union was moving ahead. It seems to have been among the first to "participate in elements of administration usually reserved for management as, for example, the professional union's reclassification of their own staff." Spicer added: "The opening of an additional channel of communication through union representation at Library Board meetings was a distinct aid to administration decision making. The staff union as a group made real contributions to the campaigns for increased funds for the library by donations and personal contacts. No evidence was presented which indicated union policy was concerned with the public interest in the efficient and economical operation of the library." If such evidence were presented then Spicer would probably have questioned the right of the union to participate in elements of administration. I'm afraid that Spicer was clearly one of those who could not make up his mind about the role of the union.[1]

---

[1] Telephone conversation with Mary L. Dyar, November 4, 1968.

[2] Telephone conversation with Louis Pignatello, November 5, 1968.

[3] Telephone conversation with Mary L. Dyar, November 4, 1968.

[4] Erik J. Spicer, Trade Unions in Libraries.

The Saint Paul Public Library

Some of the staffers are members of the City and County Employees Union Local 8 of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, but no information has been obtained regarding the number of librarians who might be members. Some of the professional employees at the library, however, do belong to the Professional Employees Association which represents all professional employees in the City of St. Paul.[2]

NEW YORK

Buffalo and Erie County Public Library

The Librarians Association of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library is playing the role of a union - and with strength. Joseph B. Rounds, the Library Director, said that the Library has been deeply involved in matters "concerning the activities of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library staff or Board of Trustees in regard to the organization of collective bargaining." Many questions, he said, are unresolved and may have to be determined by the courts.[1] There are 180 librarians in the library system.

---

[1] Erik J. Spicer, Trade Unions in Libraries.

[2] Letter from Archer J. Eggen, Director, Saint Paul Public Library, August 23, 1968.

The Association began budgetary negotiations with the Board limiting itself to salaries and educational incentives in order to allow sufficient time for the library to submit a supplemental budget to the County Budget Director. Initial agreement was reached on salary increases ranging from 17% to 24%, and educational reimbursements for courses related to the library assignments of the individuals involved.

Since the County did not seek a temporary injunction, although suit was brought by the County to enjoin the Library Board and the Association from continuing negotiations, and this matter is still in the courts, budgetary negotiations were completed and a supplemental budget request was submitted. Non-budgetary items are to be negotiated soon.[2]

Briefly, on July 29, 1968, the Board of Trustees of the Library voted to recognize and bargain with the Librarians' Association, thus, technically, setting itself up as employer and bargaining power for the library.[3] This decision was taken in opposition to the County officials who feel there should be only three bargaining agents in the County, one for the teachers, one for the Sheriff's Department and a third for all other

---

[1] Letter from Joseph B. Rounds, Director, Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, August 15, 1968.

[2] Letter from Wallace Mohn, Chairman, Librarians' Association of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library, October 30,1968.

[3] Buffalo Evening News, July 30,1968.

This is a line of reasoning somewhat akin to what we have in Massachusetts where, technically, the 1965 State law referred to in the report on the Boston Public Library, provides for collective bargaining and requires City Councils and Town Meetings to pay the bill arising out of any agreements reached. In Massachusetts, therefore, some Library Boards set up their staffs as organizations to be bargained with collectively, reached agreements and presented the fiscal authorities with the agreement and the request to foot the bill.

County employees.[1] On September 26th, therefore, the Erie County Government started a lawsuit to prevent the Board of Trustees of the Library from negotiating with or entering into contracts with the library employees. The Board of Trustees contends that it is the employer of library workers and that it has recognized the Librarians' Association as the negotiating agent under the Taylor Act in New York State.[2] The question, of course, is whether the County or the Library Board of Trustees is the "proper public employer" for collective bargaining purposes. The Library gets its financial support from the County and it is administered by the Board of Trustees.[3]

---

[1] Courier Express (Buffalo), July 30,1968.

[2] Letter from Wallace Mohn, October 30,1968.

[3] Courier Express, September 27, 1968.

There is a short and interesting history attached to this entire development provided by Wallace Mohn, Chairmanof the Librarians' Association.[1] In July, 1968, a group of librarians in the system formed an Ad Hoc committee to explore the advisability of establishing a union, a professional association, or both. While this was going on the County Executive recognized the American Federation of Teachers to represent the local two year community college, the Badge and Shield Club to represent the Sheriff's Department, and the Civil Service Employees Association to represent all other County employees (about 6,000).

The librarians, after consulting an attorney, decided not to affiliate with any union organization, one reason evidently being that many of the librarians wanted their organization to concern itself with professional matters as well as with bargaining activities. (Here, of course, lie buried the seeds of a real problem; the difficulty librarians have in bargaining for more money because of the services they perform without rationalizing the entire process on the basis of improving the profession and providing better library service.) Signatures were obtained from 147 librarians representing 82% of the system. The Librarians' Association then addressed itself to the Board of Trustees of the Library, not to the County, recognizing the Board as the employer of the librarians. The Association and the Board believe that the Board has administrative powers and that all Boards of Trustees of all Public Libraries in New York chartered as educational institutions ought to function administratively.

The Board granted recognition to the Association and advised the County Executive, explaining its interpretation of the charter and that even though the Board was not fiscally independent it had the right to negotiate with the Librarians Association. The Association then began budgetary negotiations with the Board as regards salaries and educational incentives.

---

[1] Letter from Wallace Mohn, October 30, 1968.

The County brought suit in the Supreme Court to enjoin the Board and the Association from conducting negotiations. The Association petitioned the New York State Public Employment Relations Board for recognition but the PERB felt the matter should first be decided in the courts. Briefs are now being written and the case is in the courts. The Librarians' Association plans soon to negotiate non-budgetary items.

The Association has 126 members and if the court finds against the Association it plans to appeal.

OHIO

Cleveland Public Library

The Cleveland Public Library Union, Local 1054, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO, which includes both professional and other staff members, is the active union in Cleveland. In addition, there is a lively Cleveland Public Library Staff Association. Despite all this activity, however, no collective bargaining agent has been recognized by the Library Board nor has there been any election held for the designation of such an agent, and there has been no signing of check-off cards.[1] It is important to note, however, that representatives of both organizations have been called in to attend meetings of the Board for the purpose of budget preparations and to discuss salary needs. The Library suggests that no collective bargaining agent has been designated because there are the two evidently active organizations in existence sharing the staff and it is likely that neither of the organizations has a majority of the staff.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Edward A. D'Allesandrio, Deputy Director, Cleveland Public Library, August 22, 1968.

Unionization at the Cleveland Public Library and, indeed, cooperation between the Library administration and union goes back at least thirty years. The first Cleveland union was chartered in May 1937 as a local of AFSCME, AFL, but in August it moved to the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, CIO.[2] The invaluable C.P.L. Union News which seems to have acted as a clearing house for library union information during this period (perhaps the CU Voice will carry this forward), carried an item in its January 1938 edition that the employees of the Cleveland Public Library had organized and won recognition from the library administration.[3] This was a chapter of Local 48 of SCMWA and largely due to the efforts of this union at the time the library budget for 1938 was $120,000 greater than in 1937 and the union claimed that this entire sum would be used for library salary increases.[4]

Having regard for the times, the agreement that was then made with the Librarian, Linda Eastman, was one of great enlightenment. It provided for once-a-month meetings of the Librarian, her assistant and a five member union committee; permission for the union to post notices on the bulletin boards, no discrimination against employees because of race, creed, political or union affiliation; and right of hearing with a union committee in case of dismissal, suspension, reduction in grade or pay, or transfer of any worker! This was thirty years ago. Some librarians are still fighting for this and are far from it. When a new Librarian, Charles E. Rush, was appointed, he received a committee from the union and promised to meet with it regularly.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Edward A. D'Allesandrio, September 17, 1968.

[2] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization," The Library Quarterly, IX (October, 1939), 477-510.

[3] C.P.L. Union News, II (January, 1938).

[4] C.P.L. Union News, II (March, 1938).

The union then obtained its own charter and was set up independently as Local 154 of the SCMWA, CIO, according to the mimeograph sheet published by the union on April 1, 1938.[2] 154 announced that it wanted all library workers to be members and that it had the following objectives: Definite assignment of duties in each grade; minimum salary of $1,200 annually for all full time employees; standard salary scale and scale of increases; opportunity for advancement based on objective evaluation; four weeks vacation; improvement of working conditions; extension of democratic methods in the administration of the library.

This became one of the few unions (Milwaukee was another) that was able to claim the support of organized labor and thus obtain increased budgets. The union said that it was never faced by budget trouble because of the support of Cleveland's organized workers. During the 1941 budget hearings, for example, it claimed to have asked for $65,000 for salary increases and got $63,000.[3]

The situation inCleveland has been one of cooperation between the library administration and the union and this has tended to work well for all concerned. In 1967 there was talk of merging the union and the staff association but nothing happened. The union has mobilized the force of labor to support library budgets and has conveyed to the administration the views of labor groups with regard to the provision of library facilities. At the same time, in 1967, at least, the union disclaimed any role in the area of influencing policy and said that policy should be left to the Library Board of Trustees and to the administration. The Union has, however, taken an interest in the appointment of trustees.[1]

---

[1] C. P. L. Union News, II (September, 1968).

[2] Library Union News (Cleveland), April 1, 1968.

[3] LURT, ALA Bulletin, XXXV (September, 1941), 119-23.

WASHINGTON

Seattle Public Library

While our report from the Seattle Public Library states that there is no activity on behalf of the personnel to organize a collective bargaining unit, note must be taken that there is a staff association with channels of communication to the administration by means of a personnel committee, a salary committee and a representative who attends all meetings of the Library Board.[2] Since this staff association seems to engage more seriously in matters of staff welfare than most staff associations, which confine their activities to births, weddings, and deaths, this note is included in this section of the report.

A state law passed by the 1967 Legislature permits public employees to organize for collective bargaining. While the Director of the King County Library System (Seattle) is sure that there will be more examples of bargaining in various municipalities and probably in library systems too, "We have made no preparations to date in case of such an eventuality."[3]

---

[1] K. E. Nyren. "Librarians and Labor Unions."

[2] Letter from Roman Mostar, Assistant Librarian and Head of Extension, Seattle Public Library, August 28, 1968.

[3] Letter from Herbert F. Mutschler, Director, King County Library System, August 20, 1968.

University Libraries
Operating with Unions

University of California Library at Berkeley

The libraries here have been pioneers in the unionization of university librarians as distinct from becoming part of a teachers union or the AAUP. As early as April 29, 1965, the librarians here held a general meeting to establish a library chapter of the Berkeley University Teachers Local 1474 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO. A formal chapter was established on May 5, 1965 and officers were elected.[1] The librarians are now organized in their own local 1795 of the American Federation of Teachers, with a new name, University Federation of Librarians.[2] When first formed the chapter lost no time in submitting certain points to the library administration, particularly with regard to the University's definition of academic status as applied to librarians.[3] This subject appears to be uppermost in the minds of university librarians primarily because of the fact that almost every university has a different definition of the phrase.

Since 1965 the chapter has negotiated for wages, hours and working conditions, has cooperated with locals representing non-professional employees, has been fighting for new grievance machinery, has secured overtime pay rather than compensatory time off (a very big thing in library circles!), has been demanding the posting of job openings and a reduction in the 40-hour week schedule for librarians who are required to work after 10:00 pm.[4]

---

[1] Library Journal, XC (October 1, 1965), 4027-28.

[2] Eldred Smith, "Libraries and Unions; the Berkeley Experience," Library Journal, XCIII (February 15, 1968), 717-20.

[3] Library Journal, XC (October 1, 1965), 4027-28.

[4] Eldred Smith, "Libraries and Unions; the Berkeley Experience."

The University Federation of Librarians has a publication, CU Voice, which hopes to be a clearing house of information on the conditions of librarians throughout the country.[1] There are about 150 professional librarians on the staff at Berkeley and only these are eligible to join 1795. 43 are currently members. The University has refused a dues check-off system for this or any other union.[2]

The University Federation of Librarians submitted to the University Librarian on August 12, 1968, a detailed list of suggestions and demands entitled Library Improvement Program, University of California, Berkeley. This seems to be the standard all inclusive work on the subject! Dr. James E. Skipper, who assumed the position of University Librarian last summer, says that he has been working "very closely with members of our local unions and have found that we are in agreement on practically all substantive issues. There may be some differences as to how these goals are achieved, but this remains to be seen."[3]

The City University of New York

There is a union at the City University, a Librarians Chapter of the United Federation of College Teachers, AFL-CIO, which has been around for about five years. Another organization, not a union but concerned with salaries and working conditions, is the Legislative Conference which has been in existence for 38 years. Dues check-off cards are permitted. At the City College of the City University of New York about 25% of the library staff belong to the Legislative Conference and a similar percentage to the union.[1]

---

[1] Library Journal, XC (October 1, 1965), 4027-28.

[2] Letter from Allan Covici, Editor, CU Voice, October 29, 1968.

[3] Letter from James E. Skipper, University Librarian, University of California, Berkeley, September 6, 1968.

A third organization, and an important one, is the Library Association of the City University of New York (LACUNY) which fought hard for faculty status for librarians, granted by the New York City Board of Higher Education as of November 1, 1965. LACUNY continues to strive for improved working conditions but claims to be a professional staff organization rather than a union.[2]

On December 4 and 5, 1968, elections will be held to determine whether the faculties of City University wish to be represented by the Legislative Conference acting as a collective bargaining agent, by the UFCT or by no organization.[3]

According to Harold D. Jones,[4] in 1938 the Board of Higher Education ruled that librarians were members of the instructional staff and voting members of the Library departments of their campuses. They were granted the same opportunities for tenure, retirement, sabbaticals, sick leave and health benefits as were provided for other faculty members but they were tied to the traditional administrative clerical week of 35 hours except for 30 hours during the summer. In 1946 the Board of Higher Education designated librarians as members of the faculties but this was never fully implemented. Librarians were given titles of Assistant to Librarian, Assistant Librarian and Librarian. The Director of the Budget of the City of New York held up promotions for librarians and in 1962 LACUNY membership voted to ask for bona fide faculty titles through a change in the laws eliminating library ranks. This was supported by Chancellor Baker before the Board of Higher Education and by December 1965 new titles and salaries were fixed and approved by the New York City Council.

---

[1] Letter from Philip W. Nesbeitt, General Reference Librarian, The City College of the City University of New York, October 29, 1968.

[2] Interview with Harold D. Jones, Assistant Professor, Brooklyn College Library of the City University of New York, October 30, 1968.

[3] Letter from Harold D. Jones, October 4, 1968.

[4] Harold D. Jones, California Librarian, XXIX (July 1968), 204.

The librarians still work a 35 hour week and don't have a full summer vacation and holiday intersession periods. The teaching faculty, of course, is paid on a nine-month basis and receives additional pay for teaching during the Summer Session. Since the upgrading, the union has been pressing for a number of additional benefits including the complete ten weeks vacation, holiday and intersession periods and a thirty hour week.[1]

At the same time, LACUNY, which claims membership of about 955 of the professional staff in the libraries at the City University, is urging substantial increases in financial support for collections, the appointment of a Dean of Libraries and further extension of faculty benefits to librarians. LACUNY wants all librarians to have a nine-month year, liberal time for attendance at conventions and meetings, time off for research and a clerical staff ratio of 60% for professionals.[2]

University of Pennsylvania

Local 1740, composed of a number of library employees at the University of Pennsylvania, was formed as an affiliate of the American Federation of Teachers early in 1967. This union contains both professional and non-professional personnel and they are all after higher salaries which are being kept down because faculty wives are available for employment as are students at nearby Drexel Graduate School of Library Science. There is also some indication here that the employees are seeking a voice in running the library.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Philip L. Nesbeitt, October 29, 1968.

[2] Library Journal, XCIII (April 1, 1968), 1400.

Although Nyren says that it might be healthy for a badly administered library to have the union involved in administration and that "it seems unlikely that this could be any threat to good administrators or sound administration," the fact is that a good and aggressive union must, as a matter of good administration, fight the administration of the library and make a point of seeking grievances in order to obtain increased benefits and improved working conditions for the membership. That, after all, despite claims to the contrary, is the purpose of the union; not advice and guidance on how to improve library services.

---

[1] K. E. Nyren, "Libraries and Labor Unions." Library Journal, XCII (March 1, 1967) 952.

Government Libraries

None of the State Libraries within the purview of this study has a collective bargaining agreement with librarians although Oregon has a contract awaiting signature. Most of the State Libraries simply said that there has been no collective representation on behalf of their departments and that they knew nothing about any unions among librarians in their departments. Even in those cases where State law specifically permits employees to join unions and provides that collective bargaining units in State organizations must be recognized under certain circumstances, the State Librarians often wrote that they had no collective bargaining in their organizations and, anyway, all of the people, professional and non-professional, are under the State Civil Service system. Although in several cases I replied that being under State Civil Service does not prevent anyone from joining a union and demanding collective bargaining, I did not get a reply. From what I have been able to ascertain, however, it seems clear that the Government Libraries are not being pressed in any way by unionized librarians, at least not to a degree to make it apparent.

For the purposes of this study, however, it may be helpful at this point to review what union activity we have been able to pinpoint in the Government Libraries and to review the legal status of collective bargaining in those states where we know it, again within the purview of this paper.

STATE LIBRARIES:

Arizona Department of Library and Archives reports nothing done for collective representation.[1]

The California State Library reports no collective bargaining.[2] Employees of the State of California have been specifically granted the right to organize or join employee organizations for the purposes of representation in all matters of employer-employee relations. The scope of representation covers all matters including wages and working conditions.[1] There is no indication, however, that a government body is required to enter into collective bargaining negotiations.

---

[1] Letter from Marguerite B. Cooley, Director, Department of Library and Archives, Phoenix, Arizona, August 19, 1968.

[2] Letter from (Mrs.) Carma L. Leigh, State Librarian, Sacramento, California, August 21, 1968.

The Connecticut State Library personnel come under the Civil Service and there has been no effort to organize a collective bargaining unit.[2] Some of the people at the Connecticut State Library are members of the Connecticut State Employees Association which consists of over 22,000 State employees,[3] but there is no collective bargaining.

The Illinois State Library is also not aware of the personnel of the Library undertaking any activity to organize a collective bargaining unit and that "many legal authorities would say that it is illegal for state employees to do so."

According to the Deputy State Librarian, there have been efforts from time to time to pass legislation permitting collective bargaining by state employees but they have not passed.[4] It occurs to me, however, that the real question is the type of legislation that was involved; that it might have been always too difficult to put through legislation obliging state bodies to deal collectively with organizations representing a majority of the employees of a specific unit. On the other hand there may be no objection to a state body voluntarily undertaking to deal with a collective bargaining unit.

---

[1] California Government Code, Sections 3500, 3504.

[2] Letter from Walter Brahm, State Librarian, Hartford, Connecticut, August 21, 1968.

[3] Letter from Louis D. Doerschuck, Staff Representative, Connecticut State Employees Association, Hartford, Connecticut, October 3, 1968.

[4] Letter from deLafayette Reid, Deputy State Librarian, Springfield, Illinois, August 21, 1968.

Indiana State Library reports no unions or other agencies representing State employees.[1]

Kentucky Department of Libraries advises no organization for collective bargaining although there is a newly formed organization of state employees which has not yet begun to function.[2]

Michigan State Library is a Division of the Michigan State Department of Education and staff members are under Civil Service.[3] Evidently no unions here.

New Jersey State Library's director is Roger H. McDonough, President of the American Library Association. He reported that he had had something to say on the topic of collective representation when he spoke at Pratt last spring,[4] but that was the first I had heard of the lecture. There has been no organization for the establishment of a collective bargaining unit[5] in New Jersey although this may well change in view of the passage of Senate Bill 824 called the "New Jersey Public Employment Relations Act (1968)." This Act states that "it is the policy of the State to recognize the rights of employees to form employees organizations and to negotiate with their employers," and "that employers negotiate and enter into agreements with their employees over the terms and conditions of employment and other matters of mutual concern."[6]

---

[1] Letter from Marcelle K. Foote, Director, Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Indiana, September 6, 1968.

[2] Letter from Margaret Willis, State Librarian, Frankfort, Kentucky, September 9, 1968.

[3] Letter from Francis X. Scannel, Michigan State Librarian, Lansing, Michigan, September 5, 1968.

[4] Letter from Roger H. McDonough, Director, State Library, Trenton, New Jersey, September 4, 1968.

[5] Letter from Henry J. Michniewski, Coordinator, Public Libraries, LSCA, Public and School Library Services Bureau, State Library, Trenton, New Jersey, September 4, 1968.

[6] State of New Jersey, Senate No. 824, Introduced June 3, 1968.

So here we have the librarians and other public employees invited to form collective bargaining agreements, and if they don't they are likely to be stuck.

State Library of Ohio advises no activity to organize a collective bargaining unit.[1]

Oregon State Library, has actually negotiated a basic collective bargaining contract with the Oregon State Employees Association.[2] The Oregon Legislature authorized the establishment of collective bargaining by State employees.[3] The draft contract which at this writing is awaiting signature by the Association,[4] is at hand and the following are some of the main points:

1. The Association is recognized as exclusive bargaining agent.
2. Bargaining unit consists of all classified employees of the Oregon State Library except the State Librarian and the Executive Assistant.
3. Grievance procedure here includes grievances not normally seen such as an employee having the right to file a grievance if he believe an injustice was done because of lack of departmental policy, a policy that is unfair, a deviation from policy or a misinterpretation of policy, a disagreement with another employee or supervisor, a discretionary action of the department in the application of the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission. The Association may represent or accompany the aggrieved employee in steps: a) Employee with immediate supervisor; b) Employee to the Division Director; c) Employee in writing to the Chairman of the Council of Division Directors; d) State Librarian will prepare a written statement of her decision based on

---

[1] Letter from Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian, Columbus, Ohio, September 6, 1968.

[2] Basic Collective Bargaining Contract between the Oregon State Library and the Oregon State Employees Association.

[3] Letter from Eloise Ebert, State Librarian, Salem, Oregon, September 9, 1968.

[4] Telephone conversation with Eloise Ebert, November 26, 1968.

the report of the Council. Decision of the State Librarian is final although an employee may appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

4. No strikes - no lockouts.

Nothing about wages, vacations, etc. Nothing about overtime. All of this, however, may be just a beginning for future negotiations.

Pennsylvania State Library is unaware of any activity by its personnel to organize a collective bargaining unit.[1] Pennsylvania State Employees Council, AFSCME, reports that it does not have any members from the Pennsylvania State Library.[2]

Washington State Library says that the employees have not "actively requested organization of a collective bargaining unit." The Administrative Officer of this library wrote: "Up to this time the employees have felt that two factors have made it unnecessary to have a collective bargaining unit. The first is administration of the Washington State Library agency is such that scrupulous attention to fairness and opportunity is given to each member of the staff. Secondly, those items which are normally considered negotiable are generally a matter of Civil Service rules in the Merit System Law." Both the Washington Federation of State Employees, AFL-CIO, and the Washington State Employees Association have made vigorous recruitment efforts throughout State government. There is one professional librarian who is a member of the Federation of State Employees, AFL-CIO.[3]

---

[1] Letter from Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr., State Librarian, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, September 6, 1968.

[2] Note from Reuben H. Miller, President, Pennsylvania State Employees Council, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, October 23, 1968.

[3] Letters from Administrative Officer, Washington State Library, Olympia, Washington, October 2 and 15, 1968.

FEDERAL LIBRARIES:

For some reason not immediately fathomable, there is very little apparent union activity among librarians in Federal Government libraries, let alone collective bargaining. The fact that many, if not most, of the library positions may come under civil service should not make that much of a difference. The one important factor governing this entire matter (except in the Library of Congress) is Executive Order 10988 issued bythe President, January 17, 1962, entitled "Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service." This Executive Order sets forth the general policies which govern relations between management and those employee organizations that have as a major concern the terms of employment and working conditions of their members, as follows:

1. Recognizes the right of Federal employees and employee organizations to participate in the formulation and implementation of personnel policies affecting them,

2. Provides status, recognition, and representation rights to employee organizations.

3. Establishes a system for orderly and constructive relationships between employee organizations and agency management, and

4. Defines the respective rights and obligations of employee organizations and management officials.

The National Agricultural Library has no specific employee organization for the purposes of collective bargaining. A number of professional librarians are members of the Organization of Professional Employees in the Department of Agriculture (OPEDA)[1] but that is strictly a staff organization and does not appear to act as a union.

---

[1] Letter from Patricia A. Condon, Acting Assistant Director, Program Coordination Services, National Agricultural Library, Washington, D. C., August 27, 1968.

Department of the Interior Library advised that some of the employees may be members of either the American Federation of Government Employees or the National Federation of Federal Employees but there is no certainty since "I don't feel it proper to inquire of them in this matter."[1]

Department of State Library advised stuffily: "This Department is an executive agency of the U.S. Government and the Library is staffed by Civil Service employees (surprise!). While there is a Union of Government Employees which any Civil Service employee may join on a voluntary basis, there is no exclusive union for library employees."[2] That's almost pure camp.

The Library of Congress does not operate under Executive Order 10988 in any dealings with its employees and it"has not entered into any written agreement or contract with any group for purposes of collective bargaining." There is, however, a check-off system for the members of the Locals of the UFFE and the AFGE as provided by law.[3]

The Library of Congress is prepared to recognize almost any employee organization that does not discriminate with regard to membership because of race, creed, etc., does not advocate the overthrow by force of the United States and maintains a continuous membership of not less than 50. Such a recognized organization may consult with Library officials on the formulation and implementation of personnel and administrative policies and practices, represent their members in grievance and appeals matters, and may use designated bulletin boards.

---

[1] Letters from Erik Bromberg, Director of Library Services, United States Department of Interior, Washington, D. C., August 21 and September 18, 1968.

[2] Letter from Fred W. Shipman, Librarian, Department of State, Washington, D. C., August 19, 1968.

[3] Letter from Paul L. Berry,Acting Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C., August 30, 1968.

Grievances and appeals may be presented by the organizational representative to the Head, Personnel Relations Section. An employee may have an employee organization represent him when a grievance or administrative action is appealed to a Board.[1]

None of this goes very far at all but it is evidently more than we have in most other government libraries.

This is another case of a long history of unionization, beginning with September 1917, but this is the only instance where a union in a library has existed almost continuously since it was organized more than fifty years ago.[2]

According to Berelson, the first union at the Library of Congress was a branch of Federal Employees Union No. 2 which was organized at the inception of the National Federation of Federal Employees of the AFL in 1917 and affiliated with the AFL until 1932 when NFFE withdrew from the AFL and continued as an independent labor organization. Since, however, some members wanted to continue with AFL they organized later in the year the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL, with which a library union was affiliated and it attracted many members from the NFFE local. In 1936 this FL local, which was No. 18, had a membership of over 100 but it broke up in June 1937. Some of the members then joined the NFFE and some joined the new CIO union which was organized in August 1937. Both these unions, the NFFE and the CIO remained active in the Library of Congress, the former more conservative than the latter in 1939 when Berelson reported on this.

Again, according to Berelson, the older union, functioning since

---

[1] L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, Memorandum to staff re "Employee Organizations in the Library of Congress," April 16, 1963.

[2] Bernard Berelson, "Library Unionization."

1917, was known as Federal Employees Union No. 626 of NFFE. The other one was known in 1939 as Local 28, Library of Congress, United Federal Workers of America (CIO). Back in 1939 this union was just tolerated by the library administration and the Chief Librarian refused to discuss union proposals. The CIO union, however, sent a representative to LURT in 1941.[1]

And now, as indicated above, we're back to locals of the NFFE and the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO.

Smithsonian Institution Libraries reports no knowledge of any activity on behalf of the personnel of the Libraries to organize a collective bargaining unit. Here again, most of the staff members are Civil Service and, it is pointed out, "most of the professional staff members are active in professional organizations such as S.L.A., A.L.A., A.S.I.S., etc." The Smithsonian looks to the Federal Library Committee for assistance in solving problems others might take to a labor union."[2]

Veterans Administration Library Service has a good deal of union activity[3] under Executive Order 10988.

The Veterans Administration will accord exclusive recognition to an employee organization as the exclusive representative of the employees in an appropriate unit upon evidence that a majority of the eligible employees either belong to the organization or have indicated in writing that they want to be represented by that organization. The regulations note, however, that no unit shall be established which includes both professional and non-professional employees unless a majority of such professional employees vote by secret ballot for inclusion in such unit. When an employee organization is recognized as the exclusive representative it is entitled to act for and to negotiate agreements covering all employees in the unit. The authority for entering an agreement comes from Executive Order 10988.[1]

---

[1] LURT, ALA Bulletin, (September, 1941), P119-23.

[2] Letter from (Mrs.) Mary A. Huffer, Assistant Director, Smithsonian Institution Libraries, Washington, D. C., November 7, 1968.

[3] Letter from Henry J. Gartland, Director, Library Service, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., August 20, 1968.

With all this, however, it is apparent that the librarians at V. A. have not undertaken to organize a separate organization for collective bargaining.

National Library of Medicine reports no activity to organize a collective bargaining unit and the Deputy Director is "not aware of any proposed effort in this regard. Some employees may belong to one of the several Federal employee unions but we have no way of knowing this." There cannot be very much activity in terms of union membership here otherwise the library would have to deduct dues and would certainly know more than it is letting on.

---

[1] Veterans Administration Personnel Policy Manual MP-5, Chapter 20, Employee Organization.

[2] Letter from Scott Adams, Deputy Director, National Library of Medicine, Bethesda, Maryland, September 13, 1968.

Libraries Where Unions Have Passed out of Existence

GEORGIA

Atlanta Public Library

A pamphlet published by the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL, in November 1944, referred to Chapter 8 of Local 4, AFSCME, as having been organized in Atlanta by library employees.[1] In 1947 the Library Unions Round Table referred in passing to the existence of a "union in the Atlanta Public Library."[2] The point is made in the AFSCME report that with the support of the Atlanta Federation of Trades a flat 10% increase was granted all city employees including library staff although there had not been a single salary increase for any member of the library staff for 14 years prior to 1940. Again, the report continued, in January 1944 an additional 5% increase was granted and the City Council was persuaded to adopt a schedule providing for automatic increases. The report and its tone would indicate that library employees were neither active nor effective in getting better salaries and that it was the overall labor movement in Atlanta that succeeded in getting across-the-board increases which, incidentally, benefited the librarians.

The Atlanta Public Library says it has no record on file regarding Chapter 8 of Local 4 AFSCME. The Assistant Director of the Library, however, who was employed at the Library at the time, recalls that the union was organized in 1942 and that there were eight members at the time. None of these people are now employed. Most of them retired and the others resigned.[3]

---

[1] Lynn Aschbrenner, li.brar'i:an, c.November 1944.

[2] A.L.A. Bulletin, XLI (September 15, 1947), 77-81.

[3] Letter from Mary Louise Rheay, Assistant Director, Atlanta Public Library, October 30, 1968.

Today, the staff of the Atlanta Public Library "is not organized nor is it involved in collective bargaining."[1]

MICHIGAN

Wayne County Federated Library System (Wayne, Michigan)

There is no local union in this library system at the present time.[2] But there was a union known as Library Local 771 of the Wayne County AFSCME in 1943 or 1944.[3] This union lasted until about 1964 or 1965 when the local disbanded because the Central Labor body approved a policy requesting a raise in fringe benefits rather than a straight money raise. According to Walter H. Kaiser, the County Librarian who dealt with the union during most of its existence, many of the female librarians, being unmarried or without family, withdrew from the union and it has not been activated since.

This year for the first time a union organizer has indicated a willingness to form another local at the library and all information has been passed to the full staff with the comment of the County Librarian that he thought organization "would be a good thing for the staff in the long if not in the short run." But nothing has happened; the staff has not followed through. It may be that the staff members want to save union dues; they may be altogether satisfied; or they believe they will get the advantage of any general labor agreements reached anyway. This year, as a matter of fact, the non-union represented employees of the county will receive the same contractual benefits as the organized employees.

The Wayne County Labor Relations Board signed a contract with several unions and the contract was approved by the legislative and appropriating body, but most of the professional groups are not organized nor do they bargain under union auspices.[1] This is a case where it seems clear that the librarians just don't want a union. Salaries are good, in comparison with what is going on elsewhere: A beginning librarian starts at $7,832 and moves to $9,032. A so-called Librarian VI starts at $14,096 and moves to $16,256. The County Librarian minimum is $19,120 and his maximum is $22,000.

---

[1] Letter from Mary Louise Rheay, Assistant Director, October 3, 1968.

[2] Letter from Walter H. Kaiser, County Librarian, August 26, 1968.

[3] Lynn Aschbrenner, *li.brar'i:an*, c.November 1944.

MONTANA

Butte Public Library

This one is always mentioned in library union reports and is included here to prove that we have read the literature. The Butte union was supposed to be the grand-daddy of them all[2] and, indeed, that is its single claim to fame. Anyway - the union was formed in Butte on January 11, 1934 because of the threat that the library might be closed due to lack of funds. The idea, in this strong union town, was to get organized labor actively involved to solve the problem of the library. Some of the library people wrote to the AFL, they got a federal charter, and Number 19178 was in operation.

It seems that by January 1937 the union was still in existence because Elizabeth McDonald noted that the union sent its representatives regularly each week to the Central Trades Council.[3]

The library was kept open, the debts were cleared,[4] the building was cleaned and the raisons d'etre for the union at the time were fulfilled since in this case the union was not formed to benefit the employees of the institution.

---

[1] Letter from Walter H. Kaiser, August 26, 1968. He sounds disappointed.

[2] Elizabeth McDonald, "Number 19178," Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly, I (January, 1937), 24-25. The author referred to the union as "the first librarians union."

[3] Ibid.

[4] Erik J. Spicer, "Trade Unions in Libraries."

NEW JERSEY

The Public Library of Newark New Jersey

None of the librarians on the staff are now members of a union, according to the Deputy Director.[1] There is, however, a short union history to be noted.

A staff association was organized about 1935 and was in existence until 1965. Membership in the Staff Association ranged from 30% to 80% of the staff. In 1940 a union was organized, affiliated first with AFL and later with CIO with about 8% or 10% of the staff as members. It disbanded in 1953. No elections, however, were ever held for the designation of a collective bargaining agent.[2]

---

[1] Letter from Bernard Schein, Deputy Director, September 9, 1968

[2] Letter from Bernard Schein, August 16, 1968.

Public Libraries

With Non-Professional Unions Only

NEW YORK

Ramapo Catskill Library System

At the headquarters of the Ramapo Catskill Library System in Middletown the non-professional staff has established an independent bargaining unit which has been meeting with the administration. The professionals, however, have not organized.[1] The Board of Trustees recently took action on the requests of the Non-professional Employees Organization, and the professional staff "seems a bit annoyed by the results of the collective bargaining. . . . It may change its mind and decide to organize."[2]

Rochester Public Library

There is neither a librarians union nor are the librarians covered by any larger union. The only unionized library personnel at the Rochester Public Library are about 40 people in the "labor" class covered by AFSCME, AFL-CIO general city contract.[3] Under the terms of the union contract with the City of Rochester, the "Prohibited Category" (those who may not join the union) includes all professional personnel outside the bargaining jurisdiction of the union.[4] The report in the ALA Bulletin for September, 1968, prepared by George L. Gardiner, indicating that library employees are in the union is correct only in so far as it involves labor class people and not librarians.[5]

---

[1] Letter from Eleanor C. Harris, Director, Ramapo Catskill Library System, Middletown, August 21, 1968.

[2] Letter from Eleanor C. Harris, September 18, 1968.

[3] Handwritten note from Harold Hacker, Director, Rochester Public Library, August 1968.

[4] Letter from Mary E. Cashman, Personnel Officer, Rochester Public Library, October 23, 1968.

[5] Telephone conversation with Mary E. Cashman, October 25, 1968.

The contract between the City of Rochester and the union notes that the "prohibited" group includes all employees in the exempt class and in the unclassified civil service and all professional personnel and supervisory personnel above the level of working foreman.[1]

While librarians are not in the union they do benefit from percentage salary increases and other benefits negotiated by the union.

OREGON

Library Association of Portland

There has been no movement to form a collective bargaining unit among professional librarians[2] despite the State Law passed by the 1967 Legislature which permits public employees to organize collective bargaining units. The Librarian said that there has been no indication of the possibility of the organization of a bargaining unit on the part of the professional staff although "an administrator is often the last to hear of activity."[3]

Negotiations are, however, in progress in regard to pages, and junior and senior clerks, with the Professional Technical and Office Employees Union, Local #11, affiliated with Office and Professional Employees Union, AFL-CIO. The Library also has aninformal agreement with the bindery employees who are members of the Bookbinders and Bindery Workers Union, Local 90-113, and an agreement with the Building Service Employees Union, Local 49.

---

[1] Telephone conversation with Mary E. Cashman, October 25, 1968.

[2] Letter from Mary E. Phillips, Librarian, Library Association of Portland, September 3, 1968.

[3] Letter from Mary E. Phillips, September 27, 1968.

University Libraries

In so far as the status of librarians is concerned, the university libraries are a jungle. Very few university librarians belong to unions that seek to bargain collectively. Some belong to the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, but not necessarily as librarians. Some are members of the American Association of University Professors, but that depends on their status at the university. Others are members of staff organizations which come very close to being unions .

One of the problems here seems to be the desire on the part of many librarians to achieve integration with the teaching faculty. Sometimes, in view of all this striving for integration with teachers, one may wonder whether the librarians suffer a pathetic inferiority complex. In this connection, careful consideration should be given to whether a large university library shouldn't be regarded as a completely separate academic unit and its staff treated accordingly.

As things stand now, librarians at universities hold every kind of rank from clerical to full professorship. Faculty status, for example, is quite beyond definition and means different things in different libraries. Similar terminology is used throughout the university libraries but the definitions are different in each case and often unclear. Charting the status of librarians in different universities wouldn't mean a thing because all it might mean at one university is that a librarian with faculty status has the right to faculty parking while at another it may give him the title, salary and all perquisites of a teacher.

It is also quite clear that in the existing jungle of university librarianship there is no relationship whatever between the status or lack of status of professional librarians and the incidence of unions.

At this point, therefore, it would be best to note the information obtained from university libraries on the status of librarians.

University of Alabama

Academic rank, with titles equivalent to teachers, and all privileges including sabbatical leaves.[1]

Arizona State University, Tempe

Faculty rank for the University Librarian. Other members of the professional staff have faculty status.[2]

The University of Arizona, Tucson

Faculty status; march in academic processions; may vote in faculty elections; mayrun for office in faculty organizations and eligible for membership on various faculty and university committees along with the teaching faculty.[3]

University of California, Berkeley

Academic employees with neither faculty status nor faculty rank. Academic status currently is largely an administrative designation.[4]

University of California, Los Angeles

Academic appointments, meaning they are eligible for membership in AAUP and in the Faculty Center Association at UCLA, and are invited to march in the academic procession at commencement. They do not hold faculty status or rank and are not eligible for membership in the Academic Senate nor are they eligible for sabbatical leaves.[5]

---

[1] Note from W. Stanley Hoole, Librarian, November, 1968.

[2] Letter from Alan D. Covey, University Librarian, November 6, 1968.

[3] Letter from Robert K. Johnson, University Librarian, November 7, 1968.

[4] Letter from W. E. Wenz, Library Personnel Officer, November 22, 1968.

[5] Letter from Page Ackerman, Associate University Librarian, November 26, 1968.

University of Southern California, Los Angeles

Faculty status.[1]

University of Colorado, Boulder

Integral part of university faculty with full rank, teaching titles and all perquisites.[2]

University of Denver

Faculty rank and status same basis as teaching staff.[3]

Wesleyan University, Middletown

Head Librarian holds rank of Professor and has voting privileges. The Assistant Librarian and the Associate Librarian hold faculty status but cannot vote. Rest of staff have faculty social privileges and receive, as do the university faculty, a contribution of 15% towards retirement in the TIAA.[4]

Yale University, New Haven

No faculty rank, but most faculty benefits including TIAA, insurance at group rates and members in the Yale Faculty Club.[5]

University of Miami, Coral Gables

Faculty rank. Participate in the faculty senate, serve with the faculty on all committees, earn tenure as do other faculty members.[1]

---

[1] Letter from (Miss)Gloria Valdes, Secretary to the Librarian, November 5, 1968.

[2] Letter from Leo W. Cabell, Assistant Director for Public Services, September 6, 1968.

[3] Letter from Melvin J. Klatt, Acting Director of Libraries, November 8, 1968.

[4] Note from Wyman W. Parker, Librarian, October 30, 1968.

[5] Letter from F. Bernice Field, Associate Librarian for Technical Services, November 21, 1968.

The Florida State University, Tallahassee

Faculty rank.[2]

The University of Georgia, Athens

Faculty rank and faculty status.[3]

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta

Faculty status with faculty rank. Employed on a 12 month basis whereas teaching faculty employed on nine month basis. Librarians do not receive the same salaries as teachers but have faculty privileges (i.e. tenure, retirement, insurance). One sabbatical leave has been granted with full pay for one year.[4]

University of Southern Illinois, Carbondale

Faculty status with academic rank. Sabbaticals, personal research grants, health and retirement benefits, etc.[5]

University of Chicago

Academic appointments, which do not carry faculty rank or status.[6]

Northwestern University, Evanston

No formal academic status except in a few cases. Associate University Librarian holds rank of Assistant Professor, the Medical Librarian is Professor of Medical Bibliography and the University Librarian holds Professorial appointment. Salary levels for librarians somewhat lower than for teaching faculty. Otherwise librarians have all the hard perquisites that the teaching faculty enjoy.[1]

---

[1] Note from Archie L. McNeal, Director of Libraries, November 15, 1968.

[2] Note from N. Orwin Rush, Director, November, 1968.

[3] Letter from Evelyn Fritz, Associate Director for Technical Processes, November 6, 1968.

[4] Letter from Mrs. J. Henley Crosland, Director of Libraries, November 6, 1968.

[5] Letter from Ralph E. McCoy, Director of Libraries, September 9, 1968

[6] Letter from Iris Byler, Personnel Librarian, November 6, 1968.

University of Illinois, Urbana

Full academic status.[2]

Indiana University, Bloomington

Academic appointment. Some have faculty rank and all have faculty status including fringe benefits, but librarians are on 12 month status.[3]

Purdue University, Lafayette

Full faculty rank.[4]

University of Notre Dame

Faculty status but not equivalent faculty rank. Same privileges and benefits as the teaching faculty with the exception of tenure.[5]

Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames

Academic rank of instructor or higher.[6]

---

[1] Letter from Thomas R. Buckman, University Librarian, November 11, 1968.

[2] Letter from R. B. Downs, Dean of Library Administration, September 16, 1968.

[3] Letter from Jane G. Flener, Assistant Director, November 5, 1968.

[4] Letter from John H. Moriarty, Director of Libraries and Audio-Visual Center, September 7, 1968.

[5] Letter from (Rev.) James W. Simonson, C.S.C., Director of Libraries, November 4, 1968.

[6] Letter from Warren B. Kuhn, Director, November 4, 1968.

University of Iowa, Iowa City

Faculty status.[1]

University of Kansas, Lawrence

Faculty rank but not professional titles. Librarians' salaries lag a little behind comparable salaries in the academic departments, but in other respects (tenure, sabbaticals, parking, etc.) their status is comparable.[2]

University of Kentucky,Lexington

Faculty status with rank of Librarian. Titles are equivalent to the four teaching titles and perquisites of the four grades are exactly comparable to those of the teaching faculty. Salaries are not the same.[3]

The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore

Librarians are in the Administrative Officers and Professional categories. They enjoy many of the privileges reserved for faculty (insurance, retirement benefits, contributions from the University toward college education of their children, etc.) but they are not automatically granted sabbaticals or nine month contracts, both of which are granted to faculty.[4]

University of Maryland, College Park

No faculty status or rank excepting the Director, the head of the Health and Sciences Library and the Coordinator of Reference Services. However, salaries are tied to the various faculty ranks, but not precisely.[5]

Harvard University, Cambridge

Librarians hold Corporation appointments as officers of administration.

---

[1] Letter from Leslie W. Dunlap, Director of Libraries, September 13, 1968.

[2] Letter from David W. Heron, Director, November 5, 1968.

[3] Letter from Harold D. Gordon, Acting Director, November 7, 1968.

[4] Letter from John H. Berthel, Librarian, November 4, 1968.

[5] Letter from Robert M. Pierson, Assistant Director of Libraries for Administration, November 5, 1968.

They do not hold faculty rank except for the Director of the Library who is a Professor rather than a Librarian (!). There is no corelation between Librarian and faculty titles, and very little corelation as regards salaries.[1]

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge

Faculty status, i.e. in pension fund membership, in faculty club, retirement, insurance, etc. But no rank and no right to attend faculty meetings except for the Director and two Associate Directors. No faculty rank or titles.[2]

The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

Academic status, not faculty status. 65 of the staff (three upper grades) are members of the University Senate. Everyone earning $10,000 or more has the same retirement system as the faculty.[3]

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Academic appointments with same salary floors and fringe benefits as the teaching faculty.[4]

Washington University, St. Louis

Academic status. They are not members of the faculty and have no faculty rank.[5]

The University of Nebraska, Lincoln

Faculty status.[6]

---

[1] Letter from Anthony Greco, Associate University Librarian, November 5, 1968.

[2] Note from William N. Locke, Director of Libraries, November 1968.

[3] Letter from Frederick H. Wagman, Director, November 4, 1968.

[4] Letter from E. B. Stanford, Director of Libraries, September 9, 1968.

[5] Note from Andrew J. Eaton, Director of Libraries, October 30, 1968.

[6] Letter from James M. Robbins, Staff Association President, September 19, 1968.

Dartmouth College, Hanover

The Librarian has full faculty rank; the Assistant Librarians have faculty rank but without a vote; all others carried as administrative officers and entitled to faculty fringe benefits.[1]

Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick

Full faculty status.[2]

State University of New York at Buffalo

Faculty status. However, Librarian titles, rather than professorial rank, are retained.[3]

Cornell University, Ithaca

Academic staff without faculty status or rank. Academic staff appointments provide for coverage under the faculty retirement system, one month vacation and some other minor benefits. It does not provide for sabbatic leave although academic staff are eligible to apply for special leaves which could be on the same terms as sabbatic leave.[4]

Columbia University in the City of New York

Faculty status providing privileges accruing to faculty members other than sabbatical and full summer vacation. There are no direct equivalencies with faculty salaries.[5]

New York University

Faculty status with equivalent ranks.[6]

---

[1] Note from Adelaide B. Lockhart, Assistant Librarian, November, 1968.

[2] Letter from Norman D. Stevens, Associate Librarian for Public Services, September 12, 1968.

[3] Letter from Mary B. Cassata, Head, Reference Department, November 12, 1968.

[4] Letter from J. Gormly Miller, Assistant Director, November 14, 1968.

[5] Letter from (Mrs.) Helen M. Selesky, Assistant to the Director, November 8, 1968.

[6] Letter from Paul von Khrum, Assistant Director, September 5, 1968.

University of Rochester

Librarians do not generally hold either faculty status or rank. Both go with the two highest administrative positions.[1]

Syracuse University

Academic rank with some faculty privileges but, with the exception of the Director, they do not have faculty rank nor status.[2]

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Academic status which provides some but not all of the perquisites of faculty. Salaries not exactly equivalent to faculty salaries. Librarians are on 12 month contracts. No faculty rank but librarians eligible for retirement system and insurance as faculty and are eligible for membership in the Faculty Club but not the Faculty Senate. They may apply for research grants and leave, and they receive parking stickers.[3]

Duke University, Durham

Administrative-professional but several have professorial rank. Librarians are eligible for the fringe benefits of the teaching faculty including hospitalization, retirement, university paid insurance, etc.[4]

University of Cincinnati

Six members of the library staff have faculty rank and status and three others have faculty status. There is no relationship as to salary, tenure and other things.[5]

---

[1] Letter from George R. Parks, Assistant Director of Libraries.

[2] Letter from Elizabeth S. Newlove, Assistant Director of Libraries, November 6, 1968.

[3] Letter from Clifton Brock, Acting Associate University Librarian, October 31, 1968.

[4] Letter from B. E. Powell, University Librarian, November 11, 1968.

[5] Letter from Arthur T. Hamlin, University Librarian, November 15, 1968.

Oberlin College

Only the Head Librarian has faculty status and holds the rank of Professor.[1]

The University of Oklahoma, Norman

Faculty rank, tenure, are eligible for sabbatical leaves, and have "just about all privileges and rights that teaching members of the faculty receive. Our pay scale, however, is not equal to that of other faculty members at all levels."[2]

Oklahoma State University, Stillwater

Faculty rank and faculty status. A librarian with a master's degree in Library Science and no experience is appointed with the rank of Instructor with the right to vote in general faculty meetings.[3]

University of Oregon, Eugene

Faculty status and rank, eligible for sabbatical leave and tenure, and participate in the same retirement program or other fringe benefits.[4]

Temple University, Philadelphia

Only the head Librarian has faculty status.[5]

The Pennsylvania State University, University Park

Academic rank "which is the same as faculty rank." Titles used are Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian and Librarian, equivalent to Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor. All benefits of academic rank such as tenure and sabbatical leaves. Employed on 12 month basis with 24 working days vacation and nine holidays.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Eileen Thornton, Librarian, November 18, 1968.

[2] Letter from Melville R. Spence, Associate Director for Public Services, September 6, 1968.

[3] Letter from Roscoe Rouse, University Librarian, November 8, 1968.

[4] Letter from Carl W. Hintz, University Librarian, September 6, 1968.

[5] Note from Elkan Buchhalter, Associate Library Director, November, 1968.

University of Pittsburgh

"Have ranks equivalent to the teaching faculty and enjoy all the benefits and privileges excepting sabbatical leave and tenure.[2]

Southern Methodist University, Dallas

Four librarians in charge of each of the four units have faculty rank, "most of the faculty perquisites but, unfortunately, usually not faculty salaries."[3]

Brigham Young University, Provo

Faculty status and rank.[4]

The University of Utah, Salt Lake City

Faculty rank, Beginning faculty rank of instructor is normally given to library school graduates. Experienced personnel and department heads normally given Assistant Professorships. The two Associate Directors hold Associate Professorships. Director of Libraries holds full Professorship.[5]

Washington State University, Pullman

Faculty status. Salary scales, for 11 months work, "fall somewhere near the average or median of the comparable scales for those appointed to full academic rank."[6]

---

[1] Letter from (Mrs.) Elizabeth J. Bradt, Personnel Librarian, September 9, 1968.

[2] Letter from C. Walter Stone, Director of University Libraries, November 8, 1968.

[3] Letter from Robert M. Trent, Director of Libraries, November 4, 1968.

[4] Note from Donald K. Nelson, Director, October 30, 1968.

[5] Letter from Richard W. Boss, Acting Director of Libraries, September 9, 1968.

[6] Letter from William G. Gnaedinger, Associate Director of Libraries, September 9, 1968.

University of Washington, Seattle

Academic personnel "in the sense that personnel matters relating to them are handled by the President's office rather than by the campus personnel service."[1]

In 1939, W. P. Tucker referred to the existence of a library union at the University of Washington.[2] In 1948, however, Dorothy M. Cooper, Circulation Desk Librarian at the Washington University Library wrote that a Staff Association was formed in 1935 and described its accomplishments including a reclassification of positions and some other things. Her article was entitled, "They Sniffed at a Library Union," which made me suspect that a union may never have existed here.[3] I checked with the Library and was informed that in 1939 there was on the campus a unit of the American Federation of Teachers. It was a campus-wide unit and not just a library group, although some librarians did belong. This campus unit of the AFT was active until about 1948 at which time it seems to have become inactive. It would be incorrect to say, as Mr. Tucker did, that there was a union at the University of Washington.[4]

West Virginia University, Morgantown

Academic rank together with teaching faculty. Contracts for professional librarians on a 12 month basis "as are about 30% of the teaching faculty." Department heads carry the rank of Assistant Professor, generally of Library Science.[5]

---

[1] Letter from Merwin M. Moores, Assistant Director, Personnel and Budget, September 16, 1968.

[2] W. P. Tucker. "Unionization for Special Librarians," Special Library Bulletin, XXX (February, 1939), 41-5.

[3] Dorothy M. Cooper, Library Journal, LXXIII (August, 1948), 1049-50.

[4] Letter from Merwin N. Moores, November 15, 1968.

[5] Letter from Robert F. Munn, Director of Libraries, October 29, 1968.

The University of Wisconsin, Madison

Professional librarians in supervisory positions and bibliographers normally have faculty rank, Instructor to Professor. But these appointments are for twelve months. Such librarians, it is reported, in terms of salaries and perquisites compare favorably with the teaching members of the faculty. About half the professional librarians, representing the junior positions, have academic rank as specialists which is not a faculty rank.[1]

The following University Libraries replied simply that their librarians hold neither faculty rank nor status and it is difficult to determine what status is actually held by them:

The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford.
The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Boston University
Princeton University
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
University of Texas, Austin

---

[1] Letter from Gerhard B. Naeseth, Associate Director, University of Wisconsin Library, November 6, 1968.

Conclusion

Nicholas Murray Butler insisted that, in the Garden of Eden, Adam paused at one point to say, "Eve, we're living in a period of transition."

And today, in view of the growth of unions in librarianship, the libraries and the profession are in a period of transition. We had this development way back in 1917, then in the thirties and here we are again. We had best learn to live with it.

The American Library Association has made it pretty plain that it will stick to the purposes set out in its 1879 charter: ". . . promoting the library interests of the country by exchanging views, reaching conclusions, and inducing cooperation in all departments of bibliothecal science and economy; by disposing the public mind to the founding and improving of libraries; and by cultivating goodwill among its own members. . . . " It may yet attempt to collate and make available information on the unionization of librarians but it is simply not the function of the ALA to devote itself to the improvement of the librarian's personal situation. The ALA has other, professional, things to do and should be kept at it.

The unions, on the other hand, have shown over the years that they act responsibly in the field of librarianship and can work to improve the lot of the individual librarian. Library unions have shown that they can deal with library administrations without whippings, shootings and sit-in demonstrations. In the course of this investigation only one case has been found of a library union striking a library. There is certainly every reason to believe that librarians and library unions are not keen to utilize the strike. (It may be argued that the Teachers Union wasn't inclined in past years to use the strike either - but look at them now! Strike happy.)

Teachers were able to get away with strikes because of the resulting pressure by the children on their parents - although we can now note that when the teachers' union moved out of the field of money and working conditions it also moved into trouble.

Somebody once said that if the public libraries were struck nobody would even know it let alone be worried about it. I'm not that sure, but a good public librarians' union doesn't have to strike. All reasonable aims can be achieved by a strongly representative union by making it clear to the library administration that should all else fail the union would bring all of the issues into the light of day and argue the case in public. In many cases library administrations are archaic in structure and in a weak position. Their spokesmen aren't equipped to argue out in the open and because of their structure their defenses are weak. The people in charge of libraries are altogether unaccustomed to answering in public for anything that might be going on. Library administrators shun critical publicity and are easily frightened by it and in those cases where there have been differences with unions the libraries have not done well in the publicity and have usually folded pretty quickly. The Board of Trustees at Queens Borough was tough but here, too, it rapidly acknowledged the union as sole bargaining agent although it didn't have to do so. The unions representing the staffs usually have more guts than the attorneys representing the libraries. In universities the librarians would have to have the support of the faculty and if that were not available - better forget the whole bit.

The individual librarian may at one time have been in a position to deal independently with regard to his salary and working conditions, but that isn't so any longer except in top jobs. Almost every large library has a system of grades and classifications and benefits accruing to each one - and none of this is negotiable on an individual basis. A librarian going to work is fitted into a slot. That's life, and nobody can be blamed. From time to time the slot has to be adjusted and that can best be done by a union whose job it is to negotiate the nitty gritty of salaries and working conditions on behalf of its members. The union has the experience, training and know-how to do this job.

Apparent throughout the literature, as well as in correspondence and conversations with administrators, is the degree of concern expressed that library unions may attempt to play a role in formulating library policy or in connection with the administration of the library. Here, again in the case of the public library, we are facing a rather special situation. The public library is set up neither as a one-man candy store nor as a General Motors type of institution. In this country it is usually a quasi-public institution technically administered by a Board of Trustees which may or may not be elected by the local population. The Board of Trustees usually appoints the director of the library who normally runs the show. In the large metropolitan libraries not only is the name of the director generally unknown but nobody has heard of the trustees. The library simply isn't answerable to the public.

Who, then, should formulate policy? The Director? The Trustees? Who are they? There is no reason for library administration to be horrified at an inclination by professional librarians to participate actively in formulating policy. The librarian is supposed to be trained to appreciate librarianship and it would seem that he would have a contribution to make to formulating library policy. Whether this should be done through a union or a professional staff association is another question; I would tend to lean toward the staff association on this point, but if the professional association isn't going to do it then you can bet that the union will. The trouble is that a union, oriented as it is toward getting better conditions for its members might be inclined to twist policy in favor of the librarians personally. This has happened in the case of the Teachers' union in New York.

Instead of worrying about "union" participation in policy formulation, the administrators ought to welcome librarians views on matters of policy. The librarians, for example, might be able to convey, to some degree, the needs of the local communities. The people living in the branch areas are not represented in library councils and it may be some while before they are. The librarians in this area, therefore, have a role in representing their communities and this role may continue until the unions get the kind of salaries that will permit them to move out to Hempstead or Fair Lawn and thus cut themselves off from the public and be in the position of trustees today, or until the community takes a hand in formulating policy. Right now librarians have an obligation to their profession to become involved in all phases of library policy - including the establishment and the running of branches as well as promotions, transfers and classifications. This may call for a restructuring of library administration - but that's nothing new either these days.

Librarians have been inclined to think in terms of the union versus the library association when, as a practical matter, they should be thinking of the union in addition to the library association. One cannot supplant the other. The union is needed to obtain the salaries and working conditions that the librarians ought to have. The union provides the knowledge and the muscle to achieve these ends. The professional association should apply itself to dealing aggressively with the professional aspects of librarianship and that is something the union cannot do despite protestations to the contrary. Every union of librarians has claimed that one of its purposes is to improve library service but this always boils down to increasing salaries, bettering working conditions and making the profession so much more attractive that more and better people will enter and, ergo, library service will be improved!

As a matter of economic necessity, librarians must employ the technique of unionization, as though there were no professional associations, to obtain better salaries and working conditions; and they must employ the professional associations to seek out and bring about better library service, improve the techniques of librarianship and improve the image of librarians as though there were no unions.

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent

	Reply Received From
Alabama	
Birmingham Public and Jefferson County Free Library Fant Hill Thornley, Director (3,342,000 v.)	Director
California	
Fresno County Free Library, Fresno (Mrs. Alice F. Reilly, County Librarian (522,000 v.)	County Librarian
Los Angeles Public Library Harold L. Hamill, City Librarian (3,189,000 v.)	Anthony F. Mafrica Personnel Officer
Los Angeles County Public Library William S. Geller, County Librarian (2,380,000 v.)	County Librarian, and James R. Robb Personnel Officer
Oakland Public Library Peter T. Conmy, Librarian (678,000 v.)	Librarian
Contra Costa County Library, Pleasant Hill Bertha D. Hellum, County Librarian (510,000)	County Librarian
San Bernardino County Free Library Dorothy Traver, County Librarian (562,000 v)	County Librarian
San Diego Public Library Clara E. Breed, City Librarian (753,000 v.)	City Librarian, and Marco Thorne Assistant City Librarian
SanFrancisco Public Library John F. Anderson, City Librarian (1,008,000 v)	City Librarian, and Mrs. Penelope Brewer Administrative Assistant
Colorado	
Denver Public Library John T. Eastlick, Librarian (955,000 v.)	Librarian
District of Columbia	
Public Library of the District of Columbia Harry N. Peterson, Director (1,552,000 v.)	Director

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
Georgia	
Atlanta Public Library John Hall, Director (677,000 v.)	Mary Louise Rhea, Assistant Director
Illinois	
Chicago Public Library Gertrude E. Gscheidle, Librarian (3,124,000 v.)	Alex Ladenson Acting Librarian
John Crerar Library Herman H. Henkle, Executive Director (1,000,000 v.)	Executive Director
Newberry Library Lawrence W. Towner, Director and Librarian (850,000 v.)	Director and Librarian
Indiana	
Public Library of Ft. Wayne and Allen County Fred J. Raynolds, Librarian (1,043,000 v.)	Librarian
Indianapolis Public Library Harold J. Sander, Director (836,000 v.)	Director
Kentucky	
Louisville Free Public Library Mr. C. R. Graham, Director (739,000 v.)	Arthur S. Ricketts Assistant Director
Louisiana	
New Orleans Public Library M. E. Wright, Jr., City Librarian (500,000 v.)	City Librarian
Maryland	
Enoch Pratt Free Library Edwin Castagna, Director (1,761,000 v.)	Mary L. Huber Personnel Officer
Montgomery County Department of Public Libraries George B. Moreland, Director (595,000 v.)	Norman Finkler Deputy Director

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
Baltimore County Public Library (Towson, Md) Charles W. Robinson, Director (589,000 v.)	Nancy A. Maier Personnel Officer
Massachusetts	
Boston Public Library Philip J. McNiff, Director (2,306,000 v.)	Gunars Rutkovskis Assistant to the Director
City Library, Springfield Francis P. Keough, Library Director (568,000 v.)	Library Director
Worcester Public Library and Central Massachusetts Regional Library System Headquarters Jack W. Bryant, Director (534,000 v.)	No reply
Michigan	
Detroit Public Library Charles M. Mohrhardt, Interim Director (2,057,000 v.)	Arthur W. Woodford Assistant in the Personnel Offic
Grand Rapids Public Library Donald W. Kohlstedt, Director (502,000 v.)	Director
Wayne County Public Library Board (Wayne) Walter H. Kaiser, County Librarian (725,000 v.)	County Librarian
Minnesota	
Minneapolis Public Library Ervin J. Gaines, Director (1,000,000 v.)	Mary L. Dyar Associate Director
St. Paul Public Library J. Archer Eggen, Director of Libraries (659,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Missouri	
Kansas City Public Library Richard B. Sealock, Librarian (1,000,000 v.)	Stephen S. Kirk Acting Librarian
St. Louis County Library Donell J. Gaertner, Director (676,000 v.)	Director

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
St. Louis Public Library Joseph H. Quady, Acting Librarian (1,235,000 v.)	Mrs. Alice G. Morris Personnel Librarian
New Jersey	
Newark Public Library James E. Bryan, Director (900,000 v.)	Bernard Schein Deputy Director
New York	
Buffalo and Erie County Public Library Joseph B. Rounds, Director (2,120,000 v.)	Director
Ramapo Catskill Library System Mrs. Eleanor C. Harris, Director (541,000 v.)	Director
Brooklyn Public Library John C. Frantz, Director (2,595,000 v.)	Director
New York Public Library Edward G. Freehafer, Director	Lawrence Parke Murphy Assistant to the Director
Queens Borough Public Library Harold W. Tucker, Director (2,025,000 v.)	John W. Kunkel Assistant Director of Personnel
Rochester Public Library Harold S. Hacker, Director (741,000 v.)	Director, and Mary E. Cashman Personnel Officer
Ohio	
Akron Public Library John H. Rebenack, Librarian (602,000 v.)	Librarian
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Ernest I. Miller, Librarian (2,300,000 v.)	Librarian
Cleveland Public Library (no director) (3,305,000 v.)	Edward A. D'Alessandrio Deputy Director
Cuyahoga County Public Library (Cleveland) Lewis C. Naylor, Librarian (913,000 v.)	James P. Fitzgerald Personnel Manager

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
Columbus Public Library Edward B. Daniels, Librarian (791,000 v.)	No reply
Dayton and Montgomery County Public Library William Chait, Director (957,000 v.)	Director
Toledo Public Library Robert D.Franklin, Director (865,000 v.)	Director
Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County David W. Griffith, Director (518,000 v.)	Director
Oregon	
Library Associationof Portland Mary E. Phillips, Librarian (897,000 v.)	Librarian
Pennsylvania	
Free Library of Philadelphia Emerson Greenaway, Director (2,300,000 v.)	Herman Greenberg Personnel Officer
Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh Keith Doms, Director (1,900,000 v.)	Katherine E. Crumrine Personnel Director
Rhode Island	
Providence Public Library Stuart C. Sherman, Librarian (536,000 v.)	Frank L. Hannaway Personnel Officer
Tennessee	
Memphis Public Library C. Lamar Wallis, Director (607,000 v.)	Director
Texas	
Dallas Public Library Mrs. Lillian M. Bradshaw, Director (821,000 v.)	Director
Houston Public Library Mrs. Harriet Dickson Reynolds, Director (788,000 v.)	Ann Hornak Assistant Director

Public Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
Washington	
King County Library System (Seattle) Herbert F. Mutschler, Director (514,000 v.)	Director
Seattle Public Library Willard O. Youngs, Librarian (1,243,000 v.)	Romas Mostar, Assistant Librarian and Head of Extension
Wisconsin	
Milwaukee Public Library Richard E. Krug, Librarian (1,754,000 v.)	Vivian Maddox Assistant City Librarian

Government Libraries to which Letters Sent

	Reply Received From
Arizona State Department of Library and Archives, Phoenix Marguerite B. Cooley, Director (588,000 v.)	Director
California State Library, Sacramento (Mrs.) Carma Russell Leigh, Librarian (687,000 v.)	Librarian
Connecticut State Library, Hartford Walter Brahm, State Librarian (550,000 v.)	State Librarian
Illinois State Library, Springfield Paul Powell, Librarian and Secretary of State (1,249,000 v.)	deLafayette Reid Deputy State Librarian
Indiana State Library, Indianapolis Marcelle K. Foote, Director (1,045,000 v.)	Director
Kentucky Department of Libraries, Berry Hill Frankfort Margaret F. Willis, State Librarian (2,399,000 v.)	State Librarian
Michigan State Library, Lansing Francis X. Scannell, Michigan State Librarian (997,000 v.)	Michigan State Librarian
New Jersey State Library, Trenton Roger H. McDonough, State Librarian (500,000 v.)	State Librarian, and Henry J. Michniewski, Coordinator-Public Libraries, LSCA Public and School Library Services Bureau
Ohio State Library, Columbus Joseph F. Shubert, State Librarian (900,000 v.)	State Librarian
Oregon State Library, Salem Eloise Ebert, State Librarian (690,000 "items")	State Librarian
Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg Ernest E. Doerschuk, Jr., State Librarian (500,000 v.)	State Librarian
United States:	
National Agricultural Library Foster E. Mohrhardt, Director (1,250,000 v.)	Patricia A. Condon Acting Assistant Director Program Coordination Services

Government Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
Department of Health, Education and Welfare Kanardy L. Taylor, Department Librarian (700,000 v.)	No reply
Department of Interior Library Erik Bromberg, Director of Library Services (721,000 v.)	Departor of Library Services
Library of Congress L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress (44,189,000 "items.")	Paul L. Berry Acting Librarian of Congress
National Library of Medicine, Bethesda Martin M. Cummings, Director (1,300,000 v.)	Scott Adams Deputy Director
Smithsonian Institution Libraries Mary A. Huffer, Assistant Director (600,000 v.)	Assistant Director
Department of State Library Fred W. Shipman, Librarian (550,000 v.)	Librarian
Veterans Administration Library Service Henry J. Gartland, Director, Library Service (1,214,000 v.)	Director, Library Service
Washington State Library, Olympia Maryan E. Reynolds, Librarian (722,000 v.)	Charlotte L. Wood Administrative Officer

University Libraries to which Letters Sent

	Reply Received From
Alabama	
University of Alabama Libraries W. Stanley Hoole, Librarian (835,000 v.)	Librarian
Arizona	
Arizona State University Library (Tempe) Alan D. Covey, Librarian (522,000 v)	Librarian
University of Arizona Library (Tuscon) Robert K. Johnson, University Librarian (520,000 v.)	University Librarian
California	
University of California, Berkeley James E. Skipper, University Librarian (3,113,000 v.)	University Librarian
University of California, Los Angeles Robert Vosper, Librarian (2,197,000 v.)	Page Ackerman Associate University Librarian
University of Southern California (Los Angeles) University Library Lewis F. Stieg, University Librarian (1,138,812 v.)	University Librarian Gloria Valdes, Secretary to the Librarian
Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace (Stanford) Kenneth M. Glazier, Librarian (800,000 v.)	Librarian
Stanford University Libraries Rutherford D. Rogers, Director of University Libraries (2,560,000 v.)	Director of University Libraries
Colorado	
University of Colorado Libraries (Boulder) Ralph E.Ellsworth, Director (1,205,000 v)	Leo W. Cabell Assistant Director for Public Services
University of Denver, University Libraries H. William Axford, Director (501,000 v.)	Melvin J. Klatt Acting Director of Libraries
Connecticut	
Wesleyan University Wyman W. Parker, Librarian (536,000 v.)	Librarian

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
Yale University Library (New Haven) James Tanis, University Librarian (4,831,000 v.)	F. Bernice Field Associate Librarian for Technical Services
District of Columbia	
Catholic University of America Lloyd F. Wagner, Director of Libraries (681,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Florida	
University of Miami (Coral Gables) Archie L. McNeal, Director of Libraries (728,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Florida State University (Tallahassee) N. Orwin Rush, Director (688,000 v.)	Director
Georgia	
University of Georgia Libraries (Athens) Evelyn N. Fritz, Director (per ALA Directory) (683,000 v.)	Evelyn Fritz, Associate Director for Technical Services
Emory University (Atlanta) Guy R. Lyle, Director (823,000 v.)	Director
Georgia Institute of Technology (Atlanta) Mrs. J. Henley Crolland, Director of Libraries (537,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Illinois	
Southern Illinois University Libraries (Carbondale) Ralph E. McCoy, Director of Libraries (700,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Center for Research Libraries Gordon R. Williams, Director (2,500,000 v.)	Director
The University of Chicago Library Herman H. Fussler, Director (2,406,000 v.)	Iris Byler Personnel Librarian
Northwestern University (Evanston) Thomas R. Buckman, University Librarian (1,709,000 v.)	University Librarian
University of Illinois Library (Urbana) Robert B. Downs, Dean of Library Administration (3,888,000 v.)	Dean of Library Administration

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
Indiana	
Indiana University Libraries Robert A. Miller, Director of Libraries (2,070,000 v.)	Jane G. Flener Assistant Director
Purdue University Libraries John H. Moriarty, Director of Libraries (765,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
University of Notre Dame (South Bend) (Rec.) James W. Simonson, C.S.C. Director of Libraries (736,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Iowa	
Iowa State University of Science and Technology Library Warren B. Kuhn, Director (567,000 v.)	Director
University of Iowa Libraries (Iowa City) Leslie W. Dunlap, Director of Libraries (1,226,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Kansas	
University of Kansas Libraries (Lawrence) David W. Heron, Director (1,122,000 v.)	Director
Kentucky	
University of Kentucky Libraries (Lexington) Stuart Forth, Director (1,069,000 v.)	Harold D. Gordon Acting Director of Libraries
Louisiana	
Louisiana State University Library (Baton Rouge) T. N. McMullan, Director (849,000 v.)	Charles E. Miller, President Louisiana State University Library Staff Association
Tulane University of Louisiana (New Orleans) John H. Gribbon, Director (919,000 v.)	No reply
Maryland	
Johns Hopkins University Libraries John H. Berthel, Librarian (1,399,000 v.)	Librarian

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
University of Maryland (College Park) Howard Rovelstad, Director of Libraries (725,000 v.)	Robert M. Pierson Assistant Director of Libraries for Administration
Massachusetts	
Boston University Libraries Gustave A. Harrer, Director (639,000 v.)	John Laucus Acting Director of Libraries
Harvard University Library (Cambridge) Merle Fainsod, Director (7,445,000 v.)	Anthony Greco Associate University Librarian
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries (Cambridge William N. Locke, Director of Libraries (959,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Michigan	
University of Michigan Library (Ann Arbor) Frederick H. Wagman, Director (3,376,000 v.)	Director
Wayne State University Libraries (Detroit) G. Flint Purdy, Director of Libraries (934,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Michigan State University Library (East Lansing) Richard E. Chapin, Director (1,146,000 v.)	Director
Minnesota	
University of Minnesota Libraries (Minneapolis) E. B. Stanford, Director of Libraries (2,381,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Missouri	
Washington University Libraries (St. Louis) Andrew J. Eaton, Director of Libraries (853,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Nebraska	
University of Nebraska Libraries (Lincoln) Frank A. Lundy, Director of University Libraries (739,000 v.)	James M. Robbins Staff Association President

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
New Hampshire	
Dartmouth College Libraries (Hanover) Richard W. Morin, College Librarian (905,000 v.)	Adelaide B. Lockhart Assistant Librarian
New Jersey	
Rutgers, The State University (New Brunswick) Librarian: Open Norman D. Stevens, Associate Librarian for Public Services (1,207,000 v.)	Associate Librarian for Public Services
Princeton University Librarian William S. Dix, Librarian (1,992,000 v.)	Librarian
New York	
State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries Oscar A. Silverman, Director (540,000 v.)	Mary B. Cassata, Head, Reference Department
Cornell University Libraries (Ithaca) David Kaser, Director (2,725,000 v.)	J. Gormley Miller Assistant Director
Brooklyn College Library H. G. Bousfield, Librarian (521,000 v.)	Harold D. Jones, Assistant Professor
City College of the City University of New York Libraries Bernard Kreissman, Librarian (759,000 v.)	Philip L. Nesbeitt General Reference Librarian
Columbia University Libraries Richard H. Logsdon, Director of Libraries (3,569,000 v.)	Mrs. Helen M. Selesky Assistant to the Director
New York University Libraries Charles F. Gosnell, Director of Libraries (1,585,000 v.)	Paul von Khrum, Assistant Director
University of Rochester Library John R. Russell Director, (931,000 v.)	George R. Parks Assistant Director of Libraries

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
Syracuse University Libraries Warren N. Boes, Director of Libraries (761,000)	Director of Libraries, and Elizabeth S. Newlove Assistant Director of Libraries
North Carolina	
University of North Carolina Libraries (Chapel Hill) (1,533,000 v.)	Clifton Brock Associate University Librarian
Duke University Library (Durham) Benjamin E. Powell, University Librarian (1,716,000 v.)	University Librarian
Ohio	
University of Cincinnati Library Arthur T. Hamlin, University Librarian (888,000 v.)	University Librarian
Oberlin College Library Eileen Thornton, Librarian (620,000 v.)	Librarian
Oklahoma	
University of Oklahoma Library (Norman) Arthur M. McAnally, Director (979,000 v.)	Melville R. Spence Associate Director for Public Services
Oklahoma State University Library (Stillwater) Roscoe Rouse, University Librarian (800,000 v.)	University Librarian
Oregon	
University of Oregon Library (Eugene) Carl W. Hintz, University Librarian (954,000 v.)	University Librarian
Pennsylvania	
Temple University Libraries (Philadelphia) Warren S. Owens, Director (692,000 v.)	Elkan Buchhalter Associate Director
University of Pennsylvania Libraries (Philadelphia) Warren Haas, Director of Libraries (2,056,000 v.)	Margaret C. Nolan Assistant to the Director

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd.)

	Reply received from
University of Pittsburgh Library C. Walter Stone, Director of University Libraries (1,147,000 v.)	Director of University Libraries
Pennsylvania State University Libraries (University Park) W. Carl Jackman, Director of Libraries (816,000 v.)	(Mrs.) Elizabeth J. Bradt Personnel Librarian
Tennessee	
Joint University Libraries (Nashville) Frank P. Grisham, Director (947,000 v.)	Director
Texas	
University of Texas (Austin) Alexander Moffit, University Librarian (1,724,000 v.)	Fred Folmer (no title given)
Southern Methodist University Libraries (Dallas) Robert M. Trent, Director (796,000 v.)	Director
Rice University (Houston) Richard L. O"Keefe, Librarian (514,000 v.)	Librarian
Utah	
Brigham Young University Library Donald K. Nelson, Director (552,000 v.)	Director
University of Utah Libraries (Salt Lake City) Ralph D. Thompson, Director (740,000 v.)	Richard W. Boss Acting Director of Libraries
Virginia	
University of Virginia (Charlottesville) John Cook Wyllie, Librarian (1,367,000 v.)	No Reply
Washington	
Washington State University Library (Pullman) G. Donald Smith, Director (900,000 v.)	William G. Gnaedinger Associate Director of Libraries

University Libraries to which Letters Sent (Cont'd)

	Reply received from
University of Washington Libraries (Seattle) Marion A. Milczewski, Director (1,393,000 v.)	Merwin M. Moores, Assistant Director, Personnel and Budget
West Virginia	
West Virginia University Library (Morgantown) Robert F. Munn, Director of Libraries (753,000 v.)	Director of Libraries
Wisconsin	
University of Wisconsin Library (Madison) Louis Kaplan, Director (1,635,000 v.)	Gerhard B. Naeseth Associate Director
University of Wisconsin (Madison) Center System Library Roger E. Schwemm, Director (707,000 v.)	No Reply

Unions and Employee Organizations to which letters were sent

California — Reply received from

Rudolf Lednicky, President
University Federation of Librarians
Berkeley Campus
Post Office Box 997
Berkeley, California

Allan Covici, Editor
CU Voice
University Federation of Librarians, Berkeley Campus
P. O. Box 997
Berkeley, California

Harry Fiering, Executive Director (No reply received)
District Council 49
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, (AFL-CIO)
1106 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California

Darryl Mleynek, President
Librarians' Guild, Local 1634
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, (AFL-CIO)
1106 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Wunderlich, President (No reply received)
UCLA Library Union
University of California, Los Angeles
University Research Library
Los Angeles, California

Mrs. Betty Bacon (No reply received)
Contra Costa County Library
Pleasant Hill, California

Federation of Municipal Employees (Frank Moitoza, Jr., Exec. Sec.)
995 Market Street
San Francisco, California

Connecticut

The Connecticut State Employees Association (Louis D. Doerschuck)
760 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut

Washington, D. C.

W. J. Voss, Research Director
American Federation of Government Employees (AFL-CIO)
400 1st Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20001

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
1155 15th Street, N.W. (Donald S. Wasserman, Director
Washington, D. C. Department of Research)

	Reply received from
American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) 716 North Rush Street Chicago, Illinois	(John H. Oliver, Assistant Director, Department of Research, Washington, D. C.)
Anthony G. Weinlein Research and Education Director Building Service Employees International Union (AFL-CIO) 900 17th Street, N.W. Washington, D. C.	No reply
Council of AFL-CIO Unions for Scientific, Professional and Cultural Employees 2600 Virginia Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C.	(Jack Golodner Executive Secretary)
James A. Suffridge, President Retail Clerks International Association (AFL-CIO) Connecticut Avenue and De Sales Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.	No Reply
Abraham Weiss, Research Director Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America 25 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C.	
Illinois	
Thomas L. Beagley, Director District Council 19 205 West Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60616	No Reply
Maryland	
Municipal Employees Association, Inc. 212 East Lexington Baltimore, Maryland	
Massachusetts	
Arthur Burke, Chapter Chairman Local 1526 District Council 45 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) 100 Boyle Street Boston, Massachusetts	No Reply
National Association of Government Employees (Ind) 10 Tremont Street Boston, Massachusetts	No Reply
Minnesota	
Leonard J. Pignatello, President Professional Employees Local 211 American Federtion of State,County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) 300 Nicollet Avenue Minneapolis, Minnesota	

C. J. Jungien, Secretary-Treasurer No Reply
International Guards Union of America (Ind)
932 Upper Midwest Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Nick Schneider, Business Representative No Reply
Local 8
American Federationof State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
City Hall
St. Paul, Minnesota

City and County Employees Union - Local 8 (Robert Meyer
American Federationof State, County and International Union Representative)
Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
475 Rice
St. Paul, Minnesota

Michigan

William Van Zandt, Director No Reply
District Council 77
American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, (AFL-CIO)
419 Brainard Street
Detroit, Michigan

New York

William Mohn, Chairman
Librarians' Association of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library
Lafayette Square
Buffalo, New York

Al Wurf, Executive Director (Diana Dougherty
New York State Employees Council 50 Secretary to Mr. Wurf)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
9 Chapel Street
Garnerville, New York

John Coleman, President No Reply
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
(New York City Department of Hospitals
428 West 163rd Street
New York City

Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director (Jack Stein
District Council 37 Council Representative)
American Federationof State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
71 Worth Street
New York City

Dorothy Greenman, President
Local 384 (Board of Higher Education)
American Federationof State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
319 Avenue C
New York City

Frank S. Coluccio, Secretary No Reply
Local 1087 (Board of Education employees)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
486 4th Avenue
Brooklyn, New York

Reply received from

Daniel Berlitz, Secretary
Local 1306 (Museum of Natural History) No Reply
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
505 West 168th Street
New York City

Robert W. Schmidt, President
Library Guild 1321 (Queens Borough Public Library)
American Federation of State,County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
35-51 81st Street
Queens, New York

Larry Brandwein, President
Library Build 1482 (Brooklyn Public Library)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
Bayridge District Office
73rd and Ridge Boulevard
Brooklyn, New York

Jorgen L. Petersen, Secretary No Reply
Local 1502 (Brooklyn Museum)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
14 Grange Street
Franklin Square, New York

Cornelius Brosnan, Secretary No Reply
Local 1503 (Metropolitan Museum)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
847 Castle Hill
Bronx, New York

Ernest W.Daniel, President (Reply from Mr. Daniel in
Local 1559 (Museum of Natural History) Dallas, Texas)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
101 West 109th Street
New York City

Princine Hutcherson, Secretary (Samuel Mende, Acting
Local 1707 (Community and Social Agency Employees) Executive Director)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
19 Union Square West
New York City

Dolores Berg, President No Reply
Local 1784 (New York City Department of Hospitals - Professional, Clerical
Administrative)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
65-61 Saunders Street
Rego Park, Queens, New York

David Beasley, President
Local 1930 (New York Public Library)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
71 Worth Street
New York City

	Reply received from
F. William Hetzel, President Local 74 (School and Library Employees) Building Service Employees, (AFL-CIO) 136 Liberty Street, Room 708 New York City	No Reply
Gerrit E. Fielstra, Secretary Treasurer Council of Supporting Unit Supervisors - New York Public Library 5th Avenue and 42nd Street New York City	No Reply
Leon Davis, President Local 1199 Drug and Hospital Employees Union 709 8thAvenue New York City	(Moe Foner Executive Secretary0
Jesse Kraus,Secretary-Treasurer City Employees Union Local 237 International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Ind) 214 West 14th Street New York City	(Robert Beverly Secretary-Treasurer)
Dr. Israel Kugler, President Local 1460, United Federation of College Teachers American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) 300 Park Avenue South New York City	
Albert Shanker, President United Federation of Teachers Local 2 - American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) 300 Park Avenue South New York City	(Sylvia Mendlow, Co-Chairman, UFT Library Committee)
Local 1635 American Federationof State,County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) 39 State Street Rochester, New York	No Reply
George Slattery, Jr., Secretary Treasurer District Council 30 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) Syracuse, New York	No Reply
Anne O. Seaman, Secretary-Treasurer Local 374 (New York City Quasi-Public Employees) American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) 88 Crest Drive White Plains, New York	No Reply
Ohio	
Robert A. Brindza, Director District Council 78 American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO) 2424 Euclid Avenue - third floor Cleveland, Ohio	No Reply

Eugene Stearns, President No Reply
Federation of Library Employees
Public Library of Youngstown and Mahoning County
305 Wick Avenue
Youngstown, Ohio

Pennsylvania

Reuben H. Miller, President
Pennsylvania State Employees Council, (AFL-CIO)
American Federationof State, County and Municipal Employees
610 North 3rd Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Gerald McEntee No Reply
District Council 33
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
1320 Arch Street
Philadelphia, Pa.

Texas

Don McCullar
International Union Area Director
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
P. O. Box 18242
Houston, Texas

Dillard B. Lasseter, Research and Education Director No Reply
ASCS County Office Employees, National Association of (Ind)
P. O. Box 37
New Boston, Texas

Wisconsin

John C. Zinus, Executive Director No Reply
District Countil 48
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFL-CIO)
615 East Michigan Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Irv Zink No Reply
Library Union
Milwaukee Public Library
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Library Association. "Library Unions Round Table," ALA Bulletin,
XXXIV (August, 1940), P.153;
XXXV (September, 1941), P.119-23;
XXXVI (September 15, 1942), P.104-8;
XXXVIII (September, 1944), 366-7;
XL (September 15, 1946), P.102-7;
XLI (September 15, 1947), P.77-81;
XLII (September 15, 1948), P.74-6;
XLIV (May, 1950), 193;
XLV (December, 1951), 406;
XLVI (December, 1952), 411;
XLVII (December, 1953), 573.

____________. "Third Activities Committee," ALA Bulletin, XXXIII (December, 1939), 796-7.

"Ask National Drive to Organize Librarians," ALA Bulletin, XXXIII (October, 1939), 700-701.

Beck, W. B. "Library Unions: Why? Whither?" Junior Librarian, I (January, 1940), 35-6.

Berelson, Bernard R. "Library Unionization," The Library Quarterly, IX (October, 1939), 477-510. (NYPL Catalog No. *HA)

____________. "Unionization of Professional Workers," C.P.L. Union News, III (June, 1939), 5.

"Berkeley Librarians Join Union," Library Journal, XC (October 1, 1965), 4027-8.

Black, H. T. "Impressions of the New York Public Library," Progressive Librarians Council Bulletin, I (January, 1940), 4-5.

Brandwein, Lawrence, et al, President, Library Build, Local 1482, AFSCME, AFL-CIO. "Comment," Library Journal, XCII (November 1, 1967), 3935. (Objection to report of union contract which appeared in September 15th issue Library Journal.)

____________. "Unions and Professionalism," Library Journal, XCII (February 1, 1967), 508+.

"Brooklyn Librarians Reprimanded for LJ Letter," Library Journal, XCIII (February 15, 1968), 695.

"Brooklyn Library and Union Agree on Statement," Library Journal, XCIII (April 1, 1968), 1398.

"Brooklyn Library Staff pickets in Protest," Library Journal, XCII (July, 1967), 2493.

"Brooklyn Library Union to Seek Better Service," Library Journal, XCII (January 1, 1967), 38+.

"Brooklyn Trustees and Union Approve Contract," Library Journal, XCII (September 15, 1967), 2981-3.

Burness, J. F. "Librarians Strike!" Ontario Library Review, XLIV (February, 1960), 4-5.

Chester, L. A. "Unions Come to Public Libraries," Ontario Library Review, L (February, 1966), 7-9.

Chicago Public Library Employees Union. "C.P.L. Union News," December 1937-1945. Bimonthly (irregular). (NYPL Catalog No. TDRA
+)

"Chicago Union," Wilson Library Bulletin, XII (February, 1938), 403.

Cleveland Public Library Staff Association. "News and Views," XIV.1 (November, 1949 - May/June, 1961), irregular. (NYPL Catalog No. N-10
39o)

Cleveland Public Library Union. "Library Union News," (April, 1938 - July/August - November/December, 1942), Monthly (Irregular), 1938: Bimonthly (Irregular), 1939 - . Reproduced from typewritten copy. Published by the Public Library Union of Cleveland, SCMWA, Local 254. (NYPL Catalog No. TDRA.)

Cooper, Dorothy M., Circulation Desk Librarian, University of Washington Library. "They sniffed at a library Union," Library Journal, LXXIII (August, 1948), 1049-50+.

Cottam, K. M. "Unionization for the Unhappy," Library Journal, XCII (February 1, 1967), 510.

Davies, Louise. "Librarianship and Organization," Library Journal, X (April, 1936), 543-9.

Falkoff, E. Barbara. "Should Librarians Unionize," Part II: "The Librarian and the Closed Shop," Library Journal, LXII (August, 1937), 590-95.

Ferguson, Milton James. "The Library Crosses the Bridge," ALA Bulletin, XXXII (July, 1938, 421-6.

____________. "President Believes in Free Speech for All," ALA Bulletin, XXXII (August, 1938), 522.

"First Statewide Union School Library Organization in the County Established in New York State," Wilson Library Bulletin, XLII (October, 1967), 137.

Fleming, M.S. Letter to the Editor. New Zealand Librarian, IV (October, 1940), 33-4.

Gardiner, George L. "Collective Bargaining, Some Questions Asked," ALA Bulletin, LXII (September, 1968), 973.

Goldner, J. "The Librarian and the Union," Wilson Library Bulletin, XLII (December, 1967), 387-90.

Gordon, Mrs. H. A. "Chicago's Union Program," *ALA Bulletin*, XXXIV (June 1940), 419-20.

Hale, Ruth E. "Should Librarians Unionize?" Part I: "The Librarian and the Closed Shop," *Library Journal*, LXII (August, 1937), 587-89.

Haro, Robert P. "A Call to the Meek," *Library Journal*, XCIII (April 15, 1968), 1553-4.

"In Favor of Library Workers Unions," *Library Journal*, XLVI.

Jones, Harold D. "LACUNY: A Library Association in Action," *California Librarian*, XXIX (July, 1968), 204.

Kennemer, Jewel D. "Drive to Organize Librarians," *American Library Association Bulletin*, XXXIII (December, 1939), 777-8.

Korman, A. B. "Let the Record Speak," *C.P.L. Union News*, III (June, 1939) 1.

______________. "Protest Ferguson Commen on Unions," *ALA Bulletin*, (August, 1938), 522-23.

"The L.A. (Library Association) as a Trade Union," *Liaison*, (April, 1966), 26-7.

Leon, M. "Disagrees with President Ferguson," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, XIII (September, 1938), 53.

______________. "Milwaukee Led Off," *Progressive Librarians Council Bulletin*, II (December, 1940), 4-5.

Lerner, L. A. "Union in our Library," *C.P.L. Union News*, V (June, 1941), 2.

"Librarians Form Union at Los Angeles Public Library," *Library Journal*, (August, 1968), 2777.

"Library Employees' Society of Workers," *New Zealand Librarian*, V (June, 1942), 239.

"Library Union at Chicago," *Library Journal*, LXIII (January, 1938), 80.

Library Workers Union (New York). *The Library Worker*, I-II (1935 - June, 1936), Monthly (Irregular). Ceased publication with June, 1936, when the Library Workers Union was dissolved. (NYPL Catalog No. *HND).

McAfee, I. "British Columbia Library Association Affiliates with the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada," *Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly*, IX (January 1945), 93-6.

McDonald, Elizabeth. "Number 19178," *Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly*, XXX (October, 1965), 49-51. (Reprinted from *Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly*, I (January, 1937), 24-5.

McDoncugh, Roger. "Inaugural Address," *Library Journal*, XCIII (August, 1968), 2807.

Meritt, LeRoy Charles. "Protest Ferguson Comment on Unions," ALA Bulletin, XXXII (August, 1938), 522.

"Milwaukee Librarians Unionize," Wilson Library Bulletin, XII (November, 1937), 209-10.

Morley A. "Working with NALGO," Assistant Librarian, LIV (October, 1961), 193-4.

Moulton, D. H. "Unions in the Public Service," Odds and Book Ends, XLV (Spring, 1954), 5-8.

Munn, R. R. "Administrator Looks at Library Unions," C.P.L. Union News, V (June, 1941), 7.

New York City Public Library Employees Union. Library Unionist, I - IX (February, 1940 - April, 1950), Monthly (slightly irregular). Reproduced from typewritten copy. "Published by the New York City Public Library Employees Union, Local 251, CIO, SCMWA."

"New York College Librarians Propose Development Plan," Library Journal, XCIII (April 1, 1968), 1400.

"New York Library Union Issue Goes to Arbitration," Library Journal, XCII (November 15, 1967), 4094.

"New York Union Presents First Salary Demands," Library Journal, XCIII (May 15, 1968), 1949.

Nyren K. E. "The Brooklyn Gambit," Library Journal, XCI (December 1, 1966), 5905.

__________. "Librarians and Labor Unions," Library Journal, XCII (June 1, 1967), 2115-21.

Peacock, B. Marjorie. "Trade Unionism and Library Workers," Library World, XX (1918), 259-61. Published in London. (NYPL Catalog No. *HA).

"Proposed New Zealand Library Employees Industrial Union of Workers," New Zealand Librarian, IV (April, 1941), 98-9.

"Protest Ferguson Comment on Unions," ALA Bulletin, XXXII (August, 1938), 522-3. Also Library Journal, LXIII (August, 1938), 569.

"Queens Borough Trustees Refuse Union Negotiations," Library Journal, XCII (February 15, 1967), 722.

"Queens Library to have Union Election," Library Journal, XCII (April 15, 1967), 1557.

"Queens Votes for Union in Sudden Election," Library Journal, XCII (May 1, 1967), 1783.

Scandrett, Mrs. M. S. "We Need One Another," C.P.L. Union News, III (June, 1939), 3.

Sherman,Charles E. "Unfinished Business of T.A.C.," Library Journal, LXV May 15, 1940), 406-7.

__________, "Unionization of the Profession as One Librarian Sees It," Special Libraries, XXX (February, 1939), 38-41.

Sleighton, Michael T. "Trade Union for Chartered Librarians," Assistant Librarian, LI (May, 1958), 96-7.

Smith, E. "Librarians and Unions: TheBerkeley Experience," Library Journal, XCIII (February 15, 1968),717-20.

Smith, Stewart W. "In Union Is There Strength?" Wilson Library Bulletin, XI (January, 1937), 310-11.

Spicer, E. J. comp. "Trade Unions in Libraries," Bibliography, Canadian Library Association Feliciter, V (October, 1959), 30-2.

"Strike Threat Cancelled At Chicago Public Library," Library Journal, XCII (April 1, 1967), 1398-9.

Tead, Ordway. "Professional Workers and Unionism," Special Libraries, XXX (February, 1939), 35-8.

Tucker, William P. "State Librarian Dissents," Wilson Library Bulletin, XIII (December, 1938), 271-2.

__________. "Unionization for Special Librarians," Special Libraries, XXX (February, 1939), 41-5.

Tufts, A. "Librarian and the Union," British Columbia Librarian Quarterly, XXVII (April, 1964), 7-9.

"U.F.T. (United Federation of Teachers) Organizes New State-Wide Library Council," Library Journal, XCII (October 15, 1967), 3799. Also School Library Journal, XIV (October, 1967), 123.

"Union Protests Title II Practice," Library Journal, XCII (April 15, 1967), 1688+. Also School Library Journal, XIV (April, 1967), 26+.

"Union Wins in Brooklyn Dispute," Library Journal, XCIII (March 1, 1968), 933-4.

"University of Pennsylvania Librarians Form Local 1740 AFT (American Federation of Teachers)," Library Journal, XCII (March 1, 1967), 952.

Van Kleek, M. "New Developments in Workers' Organizations," ALA Bulletin, XXXI (October, 1937), 893-4.

Wagner, Kathryn. "In Unions There is Strength. . . , "Michigan Librarian, XII (June, 1946), 3+/

Youngstown Library Staff Gets Union Representation," Library Journal, XCIII (March 15, 1968), 1090.

Add to Periodical Literature

Cottam, Keith M. "Unionization is not Inevitable," Library Journal, XCIII (November 1, 1968), 4105.

Huish, Lois, et al. "Report from the Picket Line," "Library Journal, XCIII (November 1, 1968), 4107.

"Union Dues Checkoff Set for Queens, P.L." Library Journal, XCIII (June 15, 1968), 2414.

PAMPHLETS AND TERM PAPERS

Aschbrenner, Lynn. "Li.brar'i.an (n.) One who is learning that he can't pay bills with his title or professional pride, and that with a union he can work with administration to improve library service, can have a voice in determining social policies, and can solve his economic problems, i.e. earn a decent living." Madison, Wis., American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, 1944. (NYPL Catalog No. TDB p.v.704).

Hayden, Nancy Louise. "The Librarian and the Labor Union," Term paper, L.S. 225, 1968, Immaculate Heart College (Los Angeles).

Spicer, Erik, J. "Trade Unions in Libraries (The Experience in the United States)," Term paper presented at University of Michigan,August 3, 1959.

United Public Workers of America. New York (City). Local 111, City Department Employees. Library Chapter. "Biography of a Library Local. New York City: The New York City Public Library Employees Union, SCMWA Local 251 (CIO), 1940." (NYPL Catalog No. TB P.V. 1456).

BOOK

Clopine, John. A history of Library Unions in the United States. Rochester Press, 1955. (This book was mentioned in the term paper of Nancy Louise Hayden, but she could not find it anywhere, and neither could I.)

ADDENDA

P. 85 Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore. (April 1969)

The election has been held and the Classified Municipal Employees Association was selected as the bargaining unit for the majority of City employees. However, as employees of the Pratt Library are not technically City employees, they did not participate in the election.

P. 49 Brooklyn Public Library.

More than 660 members of the Guild in May 1969 according to Brandwein.